

of Maryland, in place of M. Hampton Magruder, resigned.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. (temporary) Alexander A. Vandegrift to be the Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of lieutenant general for a period of 4 years from the 1st day of January 1944.

Col. Merritt A. Edson to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of December 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 15, 1943:

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

William Ward Currence
Raymond Joseph Getz
Avery Parsons King
Frank Wisner Lynn
Lester John Olson
Richard Coffman Shrum

To be first lieutenant, Dental Corps

Clare William Sauser

To be chaplain, with rank of first lieutenant

James Joseph McMahon

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To Corps of Engineers

First Lt. Mathew Valois Pothier

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonels, Medical Corps

Lucius Kennedy Patterson
Charles Robert Mueller
Charles Fletcher Davis
Clarence Mansfield Reddig

To be major, Medical Corps

Clifford Gordon Blitch

To be captain, Medical Corps

Joseph Arthur Gautsch
Albert Robert Larchez
William Thayer Smith

To be colonel, Dental Corps

Daniel Sumner Lockwood

To be captain, Dental Corps

Kenneth Cheney DeGon

To be colonel, Chaplains

Claude Skene Harkey

To be captain, Chaplains

Leslie Albert Thompson

TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE NAVY

Willard A. Kitts 3d to be rear admiral, while serving as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, to rank from December 1, 1943.

POSTMASTER

TENNESSEE

Gladys B. Kyle, Rogersville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Immanuel, through whom we are made heirs of the living God, direct our thoughts and cleanse our hearts that Thy will may be magnified in all our

labors. Give us plentifully of Thy wisdom and grace that we may not forget the source of Him who built this world in order.

Grant the Congress such understanding that makes error difficult, the light that makes darkness fade, and the bread of Heaven that quickens the best impulses of our souls. We pray that the devotion to our country may be as a sacred flame dedicating ourselves to righteous duty and authority and above all to the authority of a righteous and a just God. We pray that our daily demeanor may be consistent and in harmony with those precepts our mothers taught us when we made their knees the altars of our young hearts. Pour Thy redemptive grace into all breasts with that beautiful and sincere simplicity which is the terminal point of all human progress. In these approaching days, O let the moral beauty and the spiritual excellence of Jesus of Nazareth be revealed unto us. In His holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein remarks at the ceremony of the one hundred and sixty-second anniversary of the surrender of Yorktown, Va., on October 19, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects, in one to include an address by Admiral Vickery, of the Maritime Commission, and in the other to include an address by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] at Roanoke, Va.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business in order today may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two instances; in one to include a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars and in the other a letter from Mr. Mersfelder of the Kansas City Life Insurance Co.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY LAWS 1940—CONFEREES APPOINTED

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2207) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, with Senate amendments; disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DICKSTEIN, LESINSKI, and MASON.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein a speech I made at Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADMISSION OF REFUGEES TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. DICKSTEIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE FIRE INSURANCE BUSINESS

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, serious charges have been made in connection with the conduct of the business of fire insurance, and in order that Congress may be able to intelligently pass on this question I have today introduced a resolution calling for the appointment of a special committee to investigate the entire matter.

The Honorable Louis H. Pink, a director of one of the largest insurance companies and until recently superintendent of insurance for the State of New York, had this to say:

A review of fire insurance rating systems reveals two weaknesses—(1) lack of proper statistical information, and (2) rating methods unsupported by statistical experience.

This criticism by one of the best qualified insurance authorities in the United States has not, to my knowledge, been disputed or denied. A study of the hearings being conducted by another body would justify the appointment of this special committee.

The insurance companies do an annual business running into hundreds of millions of dollars and this business is done in all the States of the Union. It seems to me that it is most important not only for the insurance companies themselves but for the public to know exactly upon what basis and by whom fire-insurance rates are established. If this inquiry is had it will be a fair and impartial one, with the one object in mind of obtaining the necessary information as to

the manner in which the fire-insurance business is conducted.

THE TAYLOR CONFERENCE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, nothing that we say here today can add or detract from the great accomplishment of the Roosevelt, Stalin, Churchill conference. But it is only fitting that this body give recognition to what may be one of the most important meetings in the history of mankind.

The meeting between these three chosen leaders of their respective nations is a personal triumph for our President and Commander in Chief. Without his courageous leadership, his vision, his belief in world humanity and cooperation this meeting would probably never have taken place. It has always been his belief that if the chosen leaders of the various countries could get together, face to face, that they could solve their differences, and could propose better plans for the ratification of their peoples than could be done through the medium of lesser officials. The results of this meeting have borne him out. It is indeed a personal triumph for the President. But it is more. This meeting can be the beginning of world cooperation to prevent war in fact, not just in desire. It presents an opportunity for all nations who are desirous of the common good to work out their destinies in a cooperative manner. It is an opportunity that this Nation cannot afford to let go undeveloped. America cannot afford to let mental reservations, fear, or the sway of little minds sabotage the possibilities of this conference.

The statement of the conference has struck the keynote to future world peace and cooperation. This is the theme for the future, I quote:

We shall seek the cooperation and active participation of all nations, large and small, whose peoples in heart and mind are dedicated, as are our own peoples, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an essay written by a young constituent of mine.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD an address by Sumner Welles which appeared in the Washington Post of December 15.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE INSURANCE BILL

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain a situation for the benefit of the Members, who may be following the controversy in which I am currently engaged with the proponents of H. R. 3270, the insurance bill. Through no fault of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] nor of my own, I was not present when he delivered his speech yesterday, December 14, as a proponent of that legislation. I was attending the hearings of the Judiciary Committee of the other body on exactly the same legislation pending there.

I addressed the House on December 13 on this subject, but the gentleman from Connecticut, although present, did not have my revised and extended remarks of that date before him at the time he addressed the House on the insurance legislation on December 14, but only the extension that appeared in the Appendix on December 9 at page A5377.

I should like to add that I gave each Member of the House Judiciary Committee 3 days' personal written notice that on December 13, under special order, I would defend my remarks appearing in the Appendix of the RECORD on December 9. No member of that committee who favors H. R. 3270 appeared. I want those Members to know that I recognize the old "brush off" when I see it. They cannot destroy the correctness of my legal position with a "brush off." I just do not want them to think I am so dumb I did not recognize it. I am not that dumb.

I have only had a chance to glance at the remarks of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER]. In the first two paragraphs he says, first, that I use too many words; and, second, that what I have said is irrelevant and immaterial. As to the second charge, other Republican lawyers equally as competent as the gentleman from Connecticut hold otherwise.

As to the first, let me say to the gentleman from Connecticut that it takes much more powder to fire a 155-millimeter howitzer than it does to fire a 20-gauge shotgun. The shell of the first is far more destructive than the pellets of the latter. The armor of truth is impervious to pellets.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise for a double purpose: I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the subject of Federal crop insurance and also on the subject of whisky.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPRINGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Fairbury, Nebr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement on disposition of Government-owned tools and equipment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

POST-WAR EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR SERVICE PERSONNEL

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, on October 27, 1943, the President of the United States sent a message to the House to which he attached a report furnished by the Armed Forces Committee on Post-war Educational Opportunities for Service Personnel. That message was referred to the Committee on Education.

Since that time in conjunction with others I have been working on a bill. Today I am introducing that bill.

It is not as simple as you might think. We are doing a bit of pioneering in this particular field. I am quite sure the bill is not satisfactory to every Member of the House and probably never will be, but I do want to call upon the membership of the House and the representatives of the various service organizations and the educational people of this country to give their best thought and consideration towards assisting the membership of the House and the Committee on Education in working out a sound, sensible, constructive, and economical program for carrying on this much deserved educational work.

Most of us will recall that at the time of the passage of the teen-age draft bill there was an intimation that such a program would be put into effect. I hope that this bill will be a framework at least upon which we can write the answer to an important national problem.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the bill which the gentleman is introducing and hopes to report out seek to take care of the education of those young men whose schooling was interrupted or may be interrupted by their induction into the armed services?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes, and knowing the interest of the gentleman from Arizona in educational matters, I am counting on him to help me with the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article written by Ernest Lindley which appeared in the Washington Post today on the subject of votes for the armed forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a news release concerning the regionalization of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. Brooks addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks just made and to include the letter which General Hines wrote me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

REHABILITATION INFORMATION COMMITTEE (CLEVELAND)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Veterans' Commission of Cleveland has organized a rehabilitation information committee which has acquired space on Cleveland's public square to advise servicemen and servicewomen and their dependents how to take advantage of all services available to them.

This commission has compiled a manual listing organizations, legislative rights, and concessions designed to aid servicemen and servicewomen and their dependents.

The women's auxiliaries of the joint veterans' commission will staff the information center, which is opening December 16, and the joint veterans' committee will give every assistance to the end that servicemen and servicewomen and their dependents will receive proper advice and consideration.

This joint veterans' commission is composed of members of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, United Spanish War Veterans, the Jewish War Veterans, and the Polish-American Veterans.

To my knowledge this is the first undertaking of its kind, and I feel that the joint veterans' commission and its auxiliaries deserve the gratitude of the citizens of Cleveland and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, recently there were presented to the Director of Office of War Mobilization, petitions signed by more than 28,000 citizens of Cleveland, urging that wages and prices be stabilized, and that all measures, including Government subsidies to processors, should be used to effectuate the orders issued by the President.

Signatures to these petitions were obtained on street corners, in workshops, stores, and factories by the Cleveland Industrial Union Council.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three different matters, and to include, first, a resolution adopted by the Massachusetts Department, Disabled American War Veterans, favoring a national lottery; second, a resolution adopted by the same organization favoring a national tuberculosis hospital; and, third, a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two statements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. William H. Webb, executive vice president, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, before the Union League Club, at Philadelphia, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]?

There was no objection.

GOV. JOHN W. BRICKER, OF OHIO, AND HIS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, in 1939 John W. Bricker became Governor of Ohio. He inherited from the debacle of the previous Democratic administration a deficit of \$40,000,000.

During his first two terms, with no new or increased taxes but with increased governmental operating costs, Ohio not only operated on a pay-as-you-go basis but finished his first two terms with a surplus of over \$30,000,000.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is quoted as saying Governor Bricker has only one policy. How right the Massachusetts gentleman is. Governor Bricker does have one policy of common honesty, common decency, and common sense, and what an innovation it would be if that single policy could be applied to some of the present rudderless policy makers on the home front.

The cat in Aesop's Fables had one policy, while the fox had many tricks, but he went the way of all tricksters.

Thank God for a man today with at least one single, clear-cut policy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial and letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MUSTERED-OUT VETERANS

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a short news item from the Chicago Herald-American.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LEMKE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and further to extend my own remarks and include a release from the Department of the Interior concerning irrigation in the Salt River Valley of Arizona.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, for some time the matter of socialized medicine has been a matter of Nation-wide discussion. I have always opposed it and shall continue to oppose it, but I want to say here and now that if the medical profession of this country do not want their profession socialized they had better clean house of the racketeers within the profession.

It has come to my attention that the wife of a certain young Congressman is about to have a baby. He went to a doctor to whom a good many Congressmen go and asked him to recommend a physician, which he did. He went to see that doctor, and the doctor said, "I will be glad to take your case." When he asked, "What will you charge me?" the doctor said, "\$1,000."

I have been told that more than one Congressman has paid \$1,000 for these services.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at

LXXXIX—675

11 o'clock tomorrow. The purpose of this, I may say, is for the consideration of the conference report that we expect will be filed tonight, in accordance with the request just submitted by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will hold a very important meeting with reference to railroad labor pay. Judge Vinson will be there. I just wanted to call to the attention of the gentleman that some of our committees are meeting.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE KATHLEEN SEXTON HOLMES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have learned with profound sorrow, and the people of Mississippi will hear with profound sorrow, of the passing of one of the most popular members of the press gallery, Mrs. Kathleen Sexton Holmes, of my State, who died suddenly in New York this morning.

Mrs. Holmes was the daughter of one of Mississippi's most distinguished lawyers, the Hon. James S. Sexton, a leader in the State for many years.

On this anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights, which guarantees a free press, this distinguished lady, who had always stood for a free press and an honest press and a fair press, was suddenly called to her eternal reward.

She never attempted to impose herself on Members of the House, but was always reticent and courteous in her dealings with Members with whom she came in contact. In all my years of service, I have never known a more popular, a more pleasant, or more impartial representative of the American press than this elegant Christian lady from Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] and I may be permitted to extend our own remarks at this point in the RECORD, regarding the late Mrs. Holmes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, it was with a feeling of deep sorrow that I learned this morning of the untimely passing of a most beloved Mississippian, Mrs. Kathleen Sexton Holmes, who for many years has been a very popular member of the House Press Gallery, representing one of Mississippi's great daily papers, the Jackson Daily News.

Mrs. Holmes was an alert, brilliant character and a most interesting writer.

Her feature column, Mississippians at the Capitol, was widely read and enjoyed by thousands throughout my great State.

It was last December, shortly following my arrival in Washington, that I was privileged to meet this charming and lovable woman. From this meeting a friendship developed that has been genuinely appreciated and enjoyed by me.

I join with my colleagues in extending sympathy to her loved ones.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, as the dean of the Mississippi delegation has just so truthfully said, those of us who knew Mrs. Kathleen Sexton Holmes were deeply shocked this morning to learn of her sudden death. Mrs. Holmes, as a member of the press gallery and as a correspondent for the Jackson (Mississippi) Daily News and other publications, has endeared herself, I am sure, to all of the Members of the Mississippi delegation in Congress. And I am equally positive that I speak for the whole delegation when I say that we shall miss her very much. Her column carried in the Jackson Daily News, Mississippians in the Capitol, was a most interesting and informative column; and I am confident that the people of Mississippi will miss it.

Mrs. Holmes was the daughter of one of the outstanding members of the bar of Mississippi. Her father, Judge Sexton, was respected and loved all over the State. She, in her own right, was a woman of unusual ability, intelligence, and charm. We shall all miss her here on the Hill. We shall miss her friendly greeting and her vivacious habit of creating an atmosphere of geniality and friendliness wherever she moved.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is proper and fitting that we should pay tribute to our departed friends of other professions who have worked so patiently alongside us. Today it is my privilege to speak a word of tribute to the memory of Mrs. Kathleen Sexton Holmes, a member of the press, a correspondent for one of Mississippi's greatest newspapers, the Jackson Daily News, the daughter of a most distinguished Mississippi family and a most worthy character.

Mrs. Holmes was one of the first Mississippians I met on my arrival in Washington. From that day I found her cordial and sympathetic, a keen thinker, alert to present-day problems, and active in the discharge of the duties connected with her work.

Her sudden and untimely death, coming when her usefulness was at its peak, brings the realization that the Members of Congress, particularly the Mississippi delegation, have lost a most valuable friend.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I from Mississippi today are deeply grieved at the death of a distinguished Mississippian, Mrs. Kathleen Sexton Holmes. A member of a distinguished Mississippi family, Kathleen Sexton was a splendid credit to her family and to our State.

For some years she was Washington correspondent for the Jackson Daily News, largest newspaper in Mississippi. Mrs. Holmes was one of the first persons

I met upon my arrival in Washington. From that day she was ever helpful to me as a new Congressman. She knew Washington and the Congress. Her writings were in line with her character, true, fair, and a credit to herself and the paper which she represented.

We shall miss Kathleen Sexton Holmes and join with her family and many friends in their sorrow at the passing of a splendid woman.

AUTHORIZING THE APPOINTMENT OF AN ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 381), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2801) to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

LIBERALIZING CERTAIN SERVICE PENSION LAWS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 376), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2350) to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Pensions, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto

to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 376.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. SABATH. This rule, Mr. Speaker, makes in order H. R. 2350, and provides for 2 hours' general debate. The chairman of the Committee on Pensions, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY], however, has assured the members of the Committee on Rules that he will not use the 2 hours for debate and, instead, 1 hour will suffice. I am making this announcement so that the membership will know approximately how much time will be taken for general debate.

The Committee on Pensions, after holding hearings on the bill, reported it by unanimous vote, and the Committee on Rules, after hearing the splendid and intelligent explanation of the provisions of the bill from the chairman of the Committee on Pensions, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY], voted unanimously for the granting of a rule. Mr. Speaker, it is a meritorious bill and I feel that every Member of this House will support and vote for it, because it will increase the pensions of the deserving Spanish War veterans from \$60 to \$75 a month, a \$15 monthly increase, and the pensions of widows from \$30 to \$40 a month, a \$10 increase.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Illinois that it is a meritorious bill. These veterans and widows are entitled to the consideration extended by this bill and we are giving them this increase at about the same time that a past Congress, I think around 1920, gave a similar increase to the veterans and widows of those who served in the Civil War. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY] and all the members of the committee are to be congratulated for their constructive action in reporting this bill out.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his timely information relative to the legislation and I know that he always was in favor of such beneficial legislation. I may say from the moment that the Committee on Pensions acted favorably, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] our Democratic leader, informed me of his deep interest in this legislation and urged that early and expeditious action be taken by the Committee on Rules in order that the bill could be immediately considered by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I regard this legislation as meritorious and needed in view of the ever-increasing cost of living that has made it impossible for the Spanish-American War veterans and their families, as well as millions of other people in our country, to properly live. It is generally known and recognized that not

only the Spanish-American War veterans and their widows and dependents, but all other persons living on small allowances and fixed incomes find it extremely difficult to make both ends meet and to live in a decent American manner. The increased cost of living brought about by the pressure blocs who are seeking to eliminate price ceilings has caused a soaring of prices from week to week so that today the veterans, their widows, and people drawing low wages or with a fixed income do not have sufficient money to purchase their accustomed foods and clothing and they are thus forced to buy the cheapest of foods and wearing apparel. Therefore, it is indeed regrettable and deplorable that the highly paid leaders of the pressure blocs continue with their pressure and influence to obtain the passage of legislation that would still further increase the cost of food, yes, the cost of living. For 35 years I have supported legislation to improve the lot of our farmers and agriculture in general, but I feel that the prices and the parity payments which they now receive are more than sufficient to encourage greater production and provides not only a fair price but a fair profit.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that those responsible for the ever-increasing cost of living will realize that there must be a limit to the prices that can be paid by the 20,000,000 of persons who are earning less than \$1,200 a year, not as much as \$20 a week, and the additional 12,000,000 wage earners who make from \$20 to \$38 a week. Something must be done to hold down the prices for these wage earners who now can only buy bare necessities and the cheapest of foods. A few weeks ago I inserted some official statistics which showed that it cost a family of four from \$1,400 to \$1,700 to live in any of the 33 larger cities of the United States. Surely, it does not cost that much to live on a farm or even in a small town, but most of the workers are located in industrial sections where the increased cost of living is felt especially. They cannot understand why increases in the prices of food and necessities of life should be permitted. I was in hopes that the organization which we created, the Office of Price Administration, would be able to fix prices and put ceilings on many products, not only on farm products, but all other products. While they have done exceedingly well, they have not succeeded in holding prices down to the extent as the President and the Administration intended. Consequently, something must be done for the 33,000,000 low-pay workers and persons having small fixed incomes. However, I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that the bill before us will take care, in a small measure, of 75,000 to 100,000 of the deserving Spanish War veterans, their widows and dependents that have been so sorely in need of some relief.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not take up additional time to explain the provisions of the bill, but shall leave that to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Pensions [Mr. BUCKLEY], who, I know, will explain the bill to the satisfaction

of the membership. He is so well informed and can give the House such an intelligent report on this bill that I am satisfied in my own heart that every Member who will listen to him will vote for the bill and that it will pass unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FISH. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Rules digressed somewhat to discuss the question of inflation. I assume in wartime that there is always a certain degree of inflation. When this administration came into power some 12 years ago, the national debt was \$20,000,000,000. Today it is upward of \$200,000,000,000. It is inevitable that there is and must be a certain amount of inflation in time of war. The question is, How can we best stop that inflation? One of the best methods is to stop the spiraling of our national debt and the waste and extravagance in the bureaucratic agencies of the Government. The Congress must scrutinize all expenditures, both in war and peace.

Mr. Speaker, this is a war measure, not of this war but of the Spanish-American War.

If the Members of Congress will analyze the bill, they will realize the staggering cost of war. We all know what war costs in blood and money. Some of us forget what it means after the war is over, and what it entails in the way of further staggering burdens to the taxpayers.

I am for the legislation before us, as it is a simple act of justice to the Spanish War veterans. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Pensions and it was also reported unanimously by the Rules Committee. It will cost the Government approximately \$24,000,000 a year. It raises the pension of Spanish War veterans from \$60 to \$75. It practically includes all Spanish War veterans, because it sets the age limit at 65 years. Of necessity, as the war was fought 45 years ago, practically all Spanish War veterans are now 65 years of age. Therefore, by this resolution, we are raising the pension of practically all Spanish War veterans from \$60 to \$75 a month.

We are now establishing a precedent for World Wars Nos. 1 and 2. When veterans of World War No. 1 become 65—and that is not so far away, unfortunately, because some of us in this House were in that war—the Government will then be called upon by the establishment of this precedent, to pay World War veterans, and there were 4,000,000 of them as opposed to 300,000 in the Spanish-American War, the same amount of \$75 a month, which will involve a staggering total. It will run into billions of dollars, not millions.

This is no puny or unimportant legislation. We are establishing a precedent

and we are doing so because this is a part of the war system. We might as well know that every time we get into war we will have not only to pay the war bill, but we will have to pay the pension bill afterward. I wish that would become a deterrent to some people in this country who seem to believe it is our duty to rush into wars all over the world, or to go out even looking for wars. Some people are forgetful that wars are not only paid for at the time, but subsequently and for generations to come.

I am in favor of the bill. I believe the Spanish War veterans served our Nation in that short war, although few in number, just as gallantly and bravely and just as patriotically as those veterans of the First World War, or those who are serving now in our armed forces all over the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. ZIMMERMAN]. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

It also increases the pension of the widows from \$30 to \$40 per month, and in some instances to \$50 a month. Likewise it changes the limit of the date of marriage. I think it was in 1923, originally, and it is now raised up to 1938, so that a widow might then get this increase in pension. Perhaps that would be a controversial issue, except for the fact that the widow must be 65 years of age. That being the situation, I do not believe it will raise much controversy. What I am trying to impress upon the House is the fact that this is a very substantial increase, and does establish a precedent for the future. I am for it because of necessity; because it is one of the results of war, and probably always will be. It is placing the Spanish War veterans on the same basis as the older Civil War veterans, which went into effect in 1930, when they were about 90 years of age. But at least, it puts them on the same basis. I am not trying to fool anybody here or elsewhere, that once you adopt this rate of \$75 you are not going backward in any future war. So to that extent the bill we are about to vote on—and I do not believe there will be very much opposition to it, I hope not—is an important one, not because it will cost \$24,000,000, because \$24,000,000 today when we discuss billions on the floor of the House, is not such a vast sum; but it does establish a precedent, and that precedent in the future will entail staggering burdens upon the American people. I see no other alternative for treating our Spanish War veterans except on the same basis as our Civil War veterans. I see no alternative, as this is a part of the war program, to take care of those who fought in defense of our country when they reach the age of 65.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the legislation, but I vote for it knowingly and openly, knowing exactly what it entails upon the taxpayers and what it will mean in the future.

I would far rather pay out Government money for these pensions to our

own American war veterans than send it to foreign nations to establish worldwide glorified W. P. A.'s or boondoggling at home.

I urge the immediate passage of a liberal and generous mustering-out pay for the servicemen of the present war to enable them to provide for themselves until they have secured a permanent job. Unfortunately, the Congress has no power to pass legislation guaranteeing to the returning discharged veterans their pre-war jobs. Congress can, however, and should, provide a discharge pay of \$200 and \$50 a month for 6 months. There are already approximately 1,000,000 discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines of this war. We owe our first duty, however, to the disabled veterans, to provide them with the best hospitalization, rehabilitation, and with generous and liberal compensation. Congress will not and must not economize at the expense of the disabled war veteran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of this bill.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I favor the immediate passage of H. R. 2350 now under consideration. Its passage has too long been delayed. Its purpose is to increase the allowances to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition and their dependents. It increases the base allowance from \$60 to \$75 per month for pensions. It has other liberalizing pension provisions. As explained by the Committee on Pensions these provisions are as follows:

Section 1 of the bill would increase the rate of pension payable to those honorably discharged veterans with 90 days' service, or if less than 90 days, who were discharged for disability incurred in line of duty for total disability or upon reaching the age of 65 years from \$60 to \$75 per month.

Civil War veterans are granted \$75 per month regardless of age or disability under the act of June 9, 1930. Previously by the act of May 1, 1920, they were granted \$50 per month and later by the act of July 3, 1926, increased to \$65 per month regardless of age or disability. It will be noted that section 1 of H. R. 2350 requires age 65 or total disability to entitle veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition to the rate of \$75 per month therein provided. With the advanced age of these veterans, 45 years after the war, and the increased living costs, the increase provided by this section is believed warranted.

Section 2 of the bill would change the marriage delimiting date governing service pension to widows and remarried widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, from September 1, 1922, to January 1, 1938. The delimiting marriage date for service pension to widows of Civil War veterans is June 27, 1905, approximately 40 years after the termination of that war. The date proposed by section 2 is approximately the same length of time after the close of the

Spanish-American War. The inequalities and injustices resulting from the existing limitation by denying pension to widows married to the Spanish-American War veteran as early as 1922 and who lived with and cared for the veteran during his lifetime are accentuated by the high cost of living and advanced age precluding employment.

Section 3 of the bill would provide a reasonable increase of widows' service pension from \$30 to \$40 per month upon attainment of age 65, and grant \$50 per month to the widow who was the wife of the veteran during his war service. The latter provision is identical with that provided for Civil War widows and is in accord with the sound principle that preference should be given that class of widows. The increase to \$40 at age 65 will establish a rate comparable to that granted Civil War widows at age 70. This increase at age 65 is believed justified in the light of living costs, unemployment and general need of this group.

COST OF BILL

It is estimated by the Veterans' Administration that section 1 of the proposed bill would provide increased pensions for approximately 85,140 veterans now on the rolls at an additional cost of \$15,286,000, the first year.

As to section 2, it is estimated that the cost of the first year would approximate \$1,642,000, bringing on the rolls approximately 4,000 widows. However, if it can be assumed that only one-half of those eligible would apply and be paid the first year, the cost would approximate \$821,000, bringing on the rolls 2,000 widows the first year.

It is estimated that section 3 of the bill would affect approximately 42,000 non-service-connected widows at an additional cost of \$8,242,000 the first year.

The total cost of the bill would approximate \$24,349,000.

Mr. Speaker, the veterans of these groups are among our most loyal citizens and their services for this country and their courage and valor in time of war was an outstanding contribution to our long and distinguished military history. Their average ages are 69 years. There are 84,000 in the group. Many of them are disabled and not able to perform remunerative service in civil pursuits. The passage of this bill will recognize an outstanding service to this country. I hope there will be no delay in its enactment into law.

Mr. Speaker, I have pending in the House a bill which has for its purpose this same relief and for that reason also I am happy to vote for this bill.

Mr. FISH. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein certain newspaper articles and telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there will be no opposition of any consequence to this bill. Probably the overwhelming majority of the House and of our people are in favor of doing more than justice by the Spanish-American War veterans. Undoubtedly, too, the Congress will continue to give to the veterans of any and

of all wars perhaps not what they may ask but something that will be somewhere near adequate to enable them to carry on as they did before they went into the war. As the gentleman from New York suggested, no one knows the amount of money that will be required. My own guess is that we will continue to appropriate until there is nothing left; and as far as I am concerned that is all right, because if we are to spend the money I much prefer that it be spent among our people here at home than across the sea taking care of the people of other nations and in rebuilding other countries, in putting other countries in a position where they can go into successful competition after the war is over not only with our farmers but with the men who work in our factories. Apparently this administration has reached the conclusion that we can spend ourselves into prosperity and intends to follow that policy regardless of the war. That is not my idea.

DANGEROUS TRENDS

It was my privilege a few days ago to stand with other Members of the House and cheer our Speaker as he warned us of dangerous trends which might interfere with the winning of the war and the preservation of our Government.

Some have characterized that talk, which was to the Speaker's credit, as an effort to centralize divergent views within his own party and as an admonition to the political opposition to his party to moderate its criticism of certain phases of administrative policy.

For myself, the import of the talk is accepted at its face value, and my only regret is that the Speaker did not go further and enumerate other dangerous tendencies which interfere with an all-out war effort and which are, from their very nature, destructive of constitutional government.

Perhaps, had time permitted, and it did not, the Speaker could and would have called attention to certain administrative practices which must meet the condemnation of all who believe in and desire the preservation of the Government which has brought us so far along the road to prosperity, happiness, and security.

ARBITRARY USE OF POWER NOT GRANTED

To me, one of the most alarming and dangerous tendencies is that of administrative agencies, created by Congress or by Executive order under authority granted by Congress, to assume and exercise arbitrary power which Congress never intended to grant.

Certainly, Congress never intended to grant to the President or to any Federal agency the power to deny to the father or the brother of a man serving in the armed forces the right, the opportunity, to work in a factory which is producing for, or on the transportation line which is supplying, the man on the battle front with the materials which he must have if he is to carry on the fight.

Yet that is just what the administrative agencies have done and are now doing.

WAR DISPUTES ACT

By Public Law 89 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the N. W. L. B. was granted authority to decide certain labor disputes, but was required, in making such decisions, to conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the National Labor Relations Act and the Emergency Price Control Act, as well as to the applicable provisions of law, with the over-all proviso that—

Where no other law is applicable, the order of the Board shall provide for terms and conditions to govern relations between the parties which shall be fair and equitable to employer and employee under all the circumstances of the case.

Acting under this authority, the Board contends that it has authority to make any order which it deems necessary to settle a labor dispute. That is the position of the Board, as outlined in the testimony of its chairman, William H. Davis, and public member, Wayne L. Morse, given recently in a hearing before the Smith Committee.

The Board, in a case where an employer refused to enter into a contract containing a closed-shop or a security-of-membership clause, ordered the company to enter into such a contract.

DISREGARD OF N. L. R. A.

Under the National Labor Relations Act, an employer may enter into a closed shop or maintenance of membership contract, if he so desires, but he cannot be forced to do so.

The National Labor Relations Act goes further than that and it expressly provides—section 8—that—

It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer * * * by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization.

Now remember, the S. A. Woods Co. refused to enter into a contract with a certain union which would require it to discriminate in regard to tenure of employment and conditions of employment and encourage membership in that particular union.

Nevertheless, the W. L. B., by order, did require the S. A. Woods Co. to violate section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act.

There is no dispute about the facts. The company refused to comply with the order and the Government thereafter condemned and took over its property. The Government took over a woodworking plant, which was in part engaged in manufacturing materials which aided in the war effort. It then turned that plant over to the Murray Co., but that company has been unable, up to the present time at least, to do efficiently the work which had been carried on by the S. A. Woods Co. for 90 years.

SEIZURE OF PRIVATE BUSINESS

In this case, the Board, by its orders took away from individuals their business, turned a part of that business over to those unable to carry it on, and also

forced employees, in order to hold their jobs, to pay membership fees and dues to a union to which they did not wish to belong. The company was destroyed because it did not comply with an order of the Board.

W. L. B. ORDER CAUSES STRIKE

Now, let me cite you a case where the company did comply with a Board order, but nevertheless the plant was struck and the Board, until recently at least, has taken no action.

The Timken Roller Bearing Co. makes 75 percent of the tapered roller bearings manufactured in this country. Under a directive issued by the Board and because of fear, the company signed a maintenance-of-membership contract, with a 15-day escape clause and a provision binding the union not to strike.

In the Gambrinus war-industry plant at Canton, Ohio, was a screw-machine operator named Huffman. Huffman offended one of the union officials by telling the local director of the union in district No. 27 that he did not represent the men at the Gambrinus plant; that they were not satisfied with his representation; and that they desired to have a National Labor Relations Board election, to see if they could not be represented by other parties.

The district representative, named Abel, notified the company that Huffman was no longer a member of the union in good standing and demanded his discharge. The company complied with the contract, which it had been forced by the War Labor Board to sign, and discharged Huffman.

Evidently the employees of the company sided with Huffman, for around the 2d of April 1943 they went on strike, notwithstanding the no-strike provision contained in their contract.

That strike lasted 10 or 12 days. It threw out of employment between fourteen and fifteen hundred men in that plant and affected some 18,000 men in other plants—all engaged in war work.

The story, as told to the president of the company at the panel hearing in Cleveland, was that the men struck because they felt that Huffman had not been fairly treated by the union officer.

Huffman, after being out of work for 6 months, was reinstated in the union by its national office at Pittsburgh, and was employed by the company on the 19th of October 1943. Shortly after he was reemployed the company received a letter from the president of the local union, saying that Huffman had again been discharged from the union. The president, however, did not ask the company to discharge him, but, under the contract, it was obligatory upon the company to discharge him.

The company, rather than bring on another strike by discharging Huffman, took a chance and wrote to Philip Murray, the president of the union; to Mr. McDonald, to Mr. Wayne Morse, and Mr. William Davis, of the War Labor Board, giving them the facts and asking them what the company should do.

That letter was written on November 8, 1943. Up until the 10th day of Decem-

ber 1943, no member of the W. L. B. had replied to that letter.

The company has not complied with its union contract, in that it has not discharged Huffman. It does not discharge Huffman, because it fears that if it does so the employees who believe that Huffman has been unfairly treated by a member of his union will call another strike.

W. L. B. IGNORES PLEA

Having gotten the company into this position, the War Labor Board does not even acknowledge receipt of its complaint.

December 6, there was a strike of teamsters who drive trucks loaded with war material between Chicago and Muskegon and intervening points. The companies had agreed to pay the drivers on the assumption that the distance traveled between Chicago and Muskegon was 183 miles. Actually, the distance was 178.9 miles. Adoption of the union's estimate of the mileage called for payment on an 8-hour rather than a 6-hour basis, and it made a difference in favor of the driver of \$1.11 for each trip each way.

The company asked for a reopening and a reconsideration of the contract on that point, and, although it was admitted by all that the actual distance traveled was but 178.9 miles, action was delayed by the Board's representative. The company then refused to pay for the miles not traveled, and the drivers went on strike.

After the strike had held up the transportation of several million pounds of war material, the Board finally got busy and adjusted the controversy.

On occasion the Board makes a gesture, as, for example, where, on December 10, at Lansford, Pa., the Board ordered back to work 300 power-plant employees who had closed 10 collieries employing 7,000 men.

W. L. B. DENIES SEPARATE SANITARY FACILITIES

Under date of December 14 we learn that, at Baltimore, picket lines have been thrown around the plants of the Western Electric Co. because the War Labor Board has refused a demand for separate sanitary facilities for whites and Negroes. There is no question, as I understand the issue, of discrimination. That is to say, all the Point Breeze Employees Association is asking is that separate sanitary facilities, equal in every respect, be furnished for the whites and for the Negroes.

Inasmuch as the President's Fair Employment Practices Committee has ordered certain companies to employ and furnish equal opportunity to all, is there any reason why the War Labor Board should not afford equal sanitary facilities to the whites at Baltimore?

The Fair Employment Practices Committee and the President preach that there shall be no discrimination because of race, creed, or color. Why not go further and order that there shall be no discrimination because of union or non-union membership? Why should not the W. L. B. order that companies give employment to all qualified applicants, re-

gardless of their union or nonunion status?

Their insincerity is shown by the fact that the administration for months has been insisting upon discrimination because of nonmembership in a union.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST NONUNION WORKERS

The C. I. O. and its Communist allies insist that the poll tax, although it applies to whites and Negroes, is discriminatory and should be abolished. Yet the C. I. O. insists that no one shall work—no, not even in support of the son who may be fighting or dying across the sea—until he has become a member of the C. I. O. and contributed to its treasury—a part of which is used for campaign purposes.

Few indeed are those who believe that any individual should be discriminated against because of race, creed, or color. But it is the rankest kind of hypocrisy to give lip service to the doctrine of non-discrimination and then uphold, as the President does, the doctrine of discrimination on the basis of union membership.

When the boys go to the draft board they are not asked to show a union card. But when their brothers or their fathers go to a war industry to aid them in their fighting they must, under the order of the President's administrative agencies, produce a union membership card.

Yes, and if, for any reason, the dues have not been paid to date, by a massed picket line they are turned back at the factory's gate.

MOTHERS, FATHERS, BROTHERS OF SERVICEMEN DENIED OPPORTUNITY TO AID FIGHTING MEN

Under date of December 10, we learned that, at Detroit, Mich., 50 women employees halted work because 2 nonunion employees had been escorted into the plant by policemen, through a picket line. There, picketing dues collectors for the C. I. O. for 2 days were endeavoring to prevent nonunion and dues-delinquent union members from entering the gates.

It was on December 10 that the president of the American Rolling Mill Co. sent the following wire to Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board:

As president of the American Rolling Mill Co. and at the instance of its directors, I am laying before you a situation of grave emergency which has arisen at our plants at Zanesville, Ohio, and Butler, Pa., where we have been devoting every energy in compliance with the urgent requests of the Government to the production of armor plate and other vital war matériel.

Last August, at the insistence of the United Steel Workers of America, C. I. O., and under order of the National Labor Relations Board, there was held in these plants elections to determine whether the employees desired, as their bargaining representative, the C. I. O. In both elections the C. I. O. was rejected as the bargaining agent.

Thereafter, the C. I. O. instituted agitation to nullify the result of these elections. Beginning last Monday, December 6, the C. I. O. established a so-called picket line at the Zanesville plant whereby individuals walk in mass formation before the entrances to the plant, with the result that we have been obliged to shut down completely. This condition continues and threats are made to see that it does continue until such time

as our company disobeys the law and fails to continue to recognize the results of the election.

The situation is doubly urgent and critical because the United Steel Workers of America—Congress of Industrial Organizations, is now withdrawing its members from vital parts of our Butler plant as well, with the effect of causing an equally acute shut-down there. Representatives of the Army and Navy Departments were at the Butler plant yesterday in an effort to secure resumption of the production so vital to the national interest.

This conduct on the part of the Congress of Industrial Organizations is in violation of the formal no-strike pledge given by that organization and now recognized by Executive order. It is also inconsistent with the national labor relations law which contemplates that the result of such an election as was held shall be observed. Furthermore, it is in complete violation of the Smith-Connally Act which provides that, before any strike is called or held in a plant engaged in the production of munitions of war, certain preliminary conditions set forth in the statute shall be complied with. None of these conditions has been complied with. Finally—and even more important—this conduct by the Congress of Industrial Organizations constitutes a grave weakening of the national war effort and imperils the success of our country's arms and the lives of our soldiers and sailors throughout the world.

The National Labor Relations Act provides an orderly remedy for any matters in dispute between the United Steel Workers of America—Congress of Industrial Organizations—and the American Rolling Mill Co.; and the union should be required to pursue its remedies under the law rather than take the law into its own hands.

We desire to lay this crisis before you so that your Board and the military departments of the Government can take such action as you deem necessary and proper to accomplish the immediate termination of the illegal and unwarranted actions above mentioned, so that the flow of these vital necessities of war from these plants can be resumed immediately and without further interruption.

If you or the military departments of the Government desire conference with me or any of the other representatives of our company, we shall be glad to meet your very earliest convenience.

Monday morning I was advised by Mr. Keenan of the War Production Board that the matter had been turned over to him and the men were back at work. Whether the picket line was dispersed, I do not know.

NO-STRIKE PLEDGE VIOLATED

But we all know from the press that strike has followed strike, practically all holding up war production.

Time and again, when there was a deadlock between employer and employee, the President has ordered seizure of the plant. But never yet has he or any Federal agency ordered seizure of a union, or called upon the armed forces to disperse a massed picket line which was keeping nonunion men or union men delinquent in dues from entering factory gates.

DISCRIMINATION MUST END

It is about time that those who would win the war on the home front by entering the factory gates and working at their accustomed tasks receive the support of the administration.

It is not enough to support the men who have been drafted and sent overseas by sending them munitions of war. It is not enough to purchase the good will and the friendship of our South American neighbors. It is not enough for the President or the First Lady, or any other representative of this Government, to travel all around the world in an effort to determine strategy, promote good will, cement the alliance with our allies.

In addition to all that, we must have support and protection for those here at home who wish to produce and to transport food, clothing, munitions of war—everything that is needed so urgently by those who are bearing the heat of the battle.

Where is the consistency, where is the justice, where is the all-out support for the war effort when strikes or massed picket lines or orders of W. L. B. deny the right to work in war industries until a union has collected its tribute? I am asking the Members of this body, what are we going to do about it? Are we going to continue to draft men, fathers, if you please, and compel them to fight, yet deny to the wives, the sisters, the fathers and the brothers that they leave at home the right to help them by manufacturing munitions of war? That is what we are doing when we permit the War Labor Board to continue to issue orders like those which they have been issuing.

Yes, Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, there are dangerous trends in this country, and some of them can be ended by Congress when it reasserts, as I hope it will, its authority; again assumes the responsibility which rests upon it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the pending bill which is covered by the rule now under discussion, H. R. 2350, I hope will be passed by this House unanimously. It simply proposes to administer justice to the veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition and to the widows and dependents of those veterans. I cannot conceive of there being any substantial argument raised against the passage of this meritorious bill. But in this very connection, while we are proposing to legislate in behalf of the veterans of the Spanish War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, it is entirely proper that we should give immediate consideration to the question of taking care of those who are being discharged from the services in the present war.

I feel that this Congress owes an obligation, an immediate obligation, to the men who are being discharged by the thousands from the service in the present war to see to it that no unnecessary delays are encountered in providing a suitable system of mustering-out pay and providing for a proper piece of legislation that will insure to the returning discharged veterans a decent demobilization compensation in line and in spirit with

the provisions contained in a proposed bill offered and sponsored by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman, of course, knows that there are numerous statutes and many provisions that have been made for the benefit of all disabled, wounded, and sick soldiers as they are discharged.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to the gentleman that I am quite familiar with the fact that this Congress under the guidance of the Military Affairs Committee of this House has placed on the statute books an enormous amount of legislation designed to provide facilities to take care of the disabled soldiers of this war. Much of the complaint that arises, I am fully aware, arises not because of lack of legislation to take care of the disabled but because of administration failure to carry out the provisions of law that are now on the statute books. I direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that I am not so particularly concerned in what I am saying now about the necessity for additional legislation to provide hospitalization and care for the disabled and the wounded as I am to see to it that the economic status of the men who are returned from the service is protected so that those men after they are discharged from a hospital facility, perchance, are not compelled to go back upon a local community without employment and without means of support.

We should provide immediate means of seeing to it that when a man is discharged he has sufficient funds in his pocket to enable him to have at least a 2 weeks' or a month's vacation with pay, in the form of a cash demobilization or mustering-out pay.

We should further see to it that that soldier is protected in his economic status so he will not become dependent upon the charity of relatives or municipalities in the time intervening until he is able to secure employment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. May I say to the gentleman that the House Committee on Military Affairs has done exactly what the gentleman said we have done. He is very correct in that statement. In addition, we have conducted hearings day after day since the bill was submitted to us, and we completed what we thought were final hearings on the mustering-out pay. However, at the very hour when we were about ready to report a strictly mustering-out pay bill, the groups representing the veterans' organizations and pleading from the outside for these soldiers demanded hearings on an adjusted compensation bill that involves vast ramifications and billions of dollars, probably \$15,000,000,000. Now we are up against the problem of having to consider them both together.

We found in the course of our hearings that 635,000 men have been discharged, and out of 15,000 men in the

State of Indiana who have been discharged, less than 300 had not gotten immediate employment when they came out of the Army.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. If there are 300 that have been unable to secure employment in the State of Indiana out of 15,000 who have been demobilized, that is 300 too many if those 300 are forced to rely upon private charity.

Mr. MAY. Those 300 went on State compensation at the rate of \$60 per month.

Mr. KEEFE. That is fine. I am very glad to hear that. If the State of Indiana has provided a system of unemployment compensation for returning veterans, the State of Indiana is to be congratulated.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. The gentleman has alluded to the State of Indiana.

Mr. KEEFE. I did not allude to it, the gentleman from Kentucky did.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I should state to the gentleman that of the 300,000 men in the military service from Indiana approximately 50 percent, or 150,000, are covered by unemployment compensation insurance. Fortunately, Indiana was farsighted enough to freeze these payments when the men entered the service. Hence when they are discharged from the service, if employment is not immediately available, they will be eligible immediately to weekly payments of unemployment compensation.

Mr. KEEFE. I have no quarrel with the gentleman from Indiana. I have already eulogized his State for making such provisions. My understanding is that all States have not frozen employee rights under State laws. Is the gentleman, who is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I understand a member of the subcommittee in charge of drafting this legislation, able to state here on the floor of the House from information which he has that is authentic that the same situation exists in the other States of this Union?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I am told that so far as the percentage of them covered by unemployment insurance is concerned, the same situation exists in the other States.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is told. Is the gentleman able to state with authenticity that that same situation exists in other States of the Union?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I base my statement upon the testimony of Col. E. L. Gardner, Director of the Unemployment Security Division of the State of Indiana, and a distinguished Hoosier. Colonel Gardner stated to the House Military Affairs Committee that thus far about 15,000 Indiana men have been discharged from the armed services and that less than 300 of that number have

applied for and received unemployment compensation payments, indicating, of course, that there are plenty of jobs now available to discharged soldiers and sailors who are able to work. I am also informed that many of the States followed the practice of Indiana in freezing unemployment compensation. However, there are States that did not freeze those payments. I agree fully with the gentleman from Wisconsin that this Congress should, as soon as possible, enact legislation for muster-out pay. Such legislation will not only help the few men who now cannot find employment, but it will be a great relief to many who will be later discharged when employment will not be so easily obtained.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There are a good many veterans today who are on soldiers' relief, so I think that answers the gentleman's question. I think a mustering-out provision should be incorporated in any draft law, so that the men when they go out of the service will know they are going to be taken care of until they can adjust themselves to normal living.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not have possession of all the facts that may be in the possession of the Committee on Military Affairs. I am not stating anything in an attempt to be critical of that committee. I am taking this opportunity to urge the necessity for immediate action, in the matter of mustering-out pay.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I have already made and the remarks I expect to make now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin advocate aid for the discharged and demobilized thousands, and I can assure him that we, the Democrats, are ready to do our part, because we feel that every man who has served the country should be taken care of and provided for and should not be left to the mercy of any charitable institution. We should take care of the disabled and discharged until they are reemployed. We should go the limit for them and I know that will be done. As we have heard from the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, it would have been done before this and the bill would have been in the House now if it had not been for the fact that some of those representing these men have asked for a delay so that the bill may be amended.

I was hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that it would not be necessary for me to take a little more time. I was hopeful that for once the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] would not bring politics into the discussion of this extremely meritorious and deserving bill. Unfortunately, he

had to go back to the days when this administration came into power and refer to how much indebtedness there was and how we have increased the indebtedness.

I hope the gentleman from New York will refresh his memory and give the House and the country information as to the difference in our National income in 1933, when this administration came into power, and as of the present day. At that time the income was around \$40,000,000,000. I am told that today it is over \$160,000,000,000, four times as large as the national income then, and a sum which I know will take care of our indebtedness. With \$160,000,000,000 we can pay all that we owe or will owe within a very few years when this war is over. Of course it would not have cost as much if we had been able to prepare our defenses in time. I believe millions would have been saved, but unfortunately the gentleman from New York and others thought it was not necessary to prepare and finally, when the Japs attacked, we were obliged to go to work, and the sky was the limit that the manufacturers demanded of the country for their production of the things the Government needed for our defense and for the prosecution of the war.

Nor did the gentleman from New York state what the prices of commodities were when this administration came in, that cattle and hogs were selling for about 3 cents a pound on the hoof and that corn and wheat were selling at from 20 to 30 cents a bushel. Eggs were about 14 cents a dozen. These low prices applied to all other commodities. A price ceiling has finally been put on cattle, as I have been advocating, and unfortunately it is now up to 16 cents, where formerly, as I stated, it was 3 or 3½ cents a pound. So why not be fair about these things and give the House and the country all the facts and all the information so that they can vote and as they vote approve the efforts of this administration in the interest of the country and the people, and also what they are doing to preserve a democratic form of government? I am not going to answer the gentleman from Michigan who continues to find fault with labor and labor organizations, and when there is a cessation of work for a few hours he calls it a strike. He criticizes the War Labor Board. It seems to me that neither the War Labor Board nor any other board can satisfy the gentleman from Michigan. And as to how much there is of political alliance and aid given, may I not remind him that a great alliance was formed in 1942—that the Republicans formed an alliance with men that the gentleman from Michigan has been criticizing, such as John L. Lewis and Earl Browder, both of whom opposed President Roosevelt.

I will say this to the gentleman from Michigan and to the gentleman from New York, that these men they charge are responsible for extravagance and unnecessary expenditures, that these charges should not apply to the established or permanent departments or bureaus which are headed by Democrats, such as the Department of State, the

Interior Department, the Commerce Department, the Treasury Department, the Department of Justice, the Department of Agriculture, or the Department of Labor, that are controlled by and have at the head of them Democrats who believe in economy as contrasted with these men whom the President was obliged to put in charge of domestic affairs when he was obliged to devote all of this time to the very serious foreign situation and to the war effort when he put in charge the outstanding Republican businessmen that he thought believed in economy.

Now let us see who they are. You all know Mr. Knudsen, you know Mr. Nelson, you know Mr. Harriman. You know Mr. Stettinius. Even the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, whose Departments spend the most money, are all Republicans. So why do you charge the Democratic administration or the President with the expenditures of these large sums of money, when you should charge and put the blame upon the Republican big businessmen whom the President appointed? I am glad you applaud, and I am glad you agree with me, because I will say I always find that there are some Republicans who recognize the truth and believe in justice instead of continuously assailing and attacking and criticizing and getting in the limelight in the unfriendly newspapers.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I will yield in a moment, as soon as I express my admiration for the speech made by the Speaker on Thursday, December 9. I regret that I was not present to hear it. When I read it and when I heard about it I was impressed that he had talked to the hearts of men, that they will take into consideration his appeal for unity and harmony and cooperation and that the sniping and criticizing and attacking and weakening our position in the eyes of the people of the world over, will cease.

I now yield to my esteemed friend, the leader of the Republican Party, of the minority, in which important position I hope he will continue.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Your dreams in that respect are not going to come true.

Mr. SABATH. As a rule they do.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Not in this instance.

I would like to ask the gentleman, in all fairness, since he has dwelt at some length upon his own fairness, who is responsible for the appointment of the head of the O. P. A. and every other bureau in this country? Is it not a fact that the man who appoints these men and keeps them in office must be held responsible? He can remove them any time he wants to.

Mr. SABATH. I say to you, answering your question, it was President Franklin D. Roosevelt who appointed most of these men, but he appointed them because they were represented to him and he had reason to believe they were the outstanding businessmen of the Nation and that they would protect its interests.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the President thinks otherwise today, why does he not remove them?

Mr. SABATH. In the midst of war this would not be the time to remove anybody. I would not even believe you should be removed or any other Republican who is here doing his duty by his country.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman claim that if there is inefficiency and bungling going on in time of war, when we need efficiency more than at any other time, we are going to allow it to continue?

Mr. SABATH. Let me say to you, the charge of inefficiency is bunk on the part of any man who makes such charge, because when they are called upon to testify and give evidence—

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Nobody is making any charge. You are admitting it on the floor of the House.

Mr. SABATH. No; wait a second. I am not admitting any such thing. I only point out that in the daily charges made on the floor and in the press about the bungling and inefficiency are not justified by the facts and never can be substantiated.

I want to be fair. I am told a certain Senator charged that there were about \$6,000,000,000 wasted upon our neighbors to the south of us. After careful investigation the amount went down from \$6,000,000,000 to \$167,000,000, not even one-fortieth part of his statement was true or was borne out by the facts. In view of that fact you should see to it, you are a fair man, of course I know you are the Republican leader, but you should see to it that the Republican Members do not make these charges which cannot be substantiated because it hurts our country.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Let us get back to the original argument.

Mr. SABATH. These reckless charges and insinuations are hurting our unity and are not conducive, or encouraging, to our brave and courageous men who are giving their all for our country, who are disheartened to read these charges, not knowing, not realizing, that they are not borne out by the facts, and most of them are made for purely political reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2350) to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2350, with Mr. COFFEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective the 1st day of the month following the date of enactment of this act the \$60 monthly rate of pension payable for total disability to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition under section 1 of the act of June 2, 1930 (46 Stat. 492; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 365), and the \$60 monthly rate of pension payable to such veterans upon reaching the age of 65 years under the provisions of section 1 of the act of May 24, 1938 (52 Stat. 440; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 370), are hereby increased to \$75.

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of May 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 382; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 364a), wherein for pension purposes, as to the widow of any deceased veteran of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, the marriage date is defined as September 1, 1922, is hereby amended, effective the 1st day of the month following the date of enactment of this act, by striking out the date "September 1, 1922" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "January 1, 1938."

SEC. 3. The act of May 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 382-384; U. S. C., title 38, secs. 364-364f) is hereby amended, effective the 1st day of the month following the date of enactment of this act, by adding a new section thereto numbered 8, to read as follows:

"Sec. 8. The \$30 monthly pension payable to widows and former widows under the provisions of section 2 of this act, as amended, shall be increased to \$40 per month when the age of 65 years is attained, and the widow or former widow who was the wife of the soldier, sailor, or marine during the period of his service, as defined in section 2 of this act, shall be paid a pension at the rate of \$50 per month."

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, the following statement is made in support of H. R. 2350, a bill to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents.

The bill (H. R. 2350) was unanimously reported by the Committee on Pensions on October 14, 1943.

Briefly, the bill (H. R. 2350) would authorize service pensions to veterans and widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection and China Relief Expedition more nearly on a parity with veterans and widows of deceased veterans of the Civil War. H. R. 2350 does not go as far as the existing service pension laws pertaining to veterans of the Civil War as they receive a minimum of \$75 per month and practically all of them qualify at the present time for the rate of \$100 per month.

H. R. 2350 would grant the \$75 rate only at age 65 or where the veteran is totally disabled. Their rate at present is \$60 for age 65 or total disability with lesser rates for age 62 or disability less than total.

The marriage date for widows of Spanish-American War veterans is now September 1, 1922, which date would be changed to January 1, 1938, 40 years after the beginning of the Spanish American War and 36 years after the close of the Philippine Insurrection, whereas the Civil War widows' delimiting date is June 27, 1905, 44 years after the beginning of the Civil War and 40 years after the end of that war.

H. R. 2350 would also grant widows \$40 per month if age 65 or over and \$50 per month if the widow was the wife of the veteran during his service in the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, or China Relief Expedition. The \$50 rate and eligibility requirements are identical with Civil War laws and the \$40 rate is identical with the Civil War rate but the age for eligibility is 65 years instead of 70, taking into consideration the unemployability of widows age 65 or over. The existing law grants a widow of a Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection or China Relief Expedition veteran only one rate, namely \$30 per month.

The estimated cost for the first year furnished by the Veterans' Administration is as follows:

SECTION 1. \$75 for age 65 or total disability affecting 85,140 veterans.....	\$15,286,000
SEC. 2. Widows marriage date change to Jan. 1, 1938, affecting 4,000 widows.....	1,642,000
If one-half apply the first year.....	821,000
SEC. 3. \$40 rate for widow, age 65; \$50 rate for widow if married to veteran during war 42,000 widows affected.....	8,242,000
Total estimated cost first year.....	24,349,000

From what I have stated you will note that this bill does not go as far as the existing laws pertaining to Civil War veterans. You will recall that the Economy Act of March 20, 1933, repealed the service pension laws pertaining to veterans and dependents of deceased veterans. However, the President approved complete restoration of those laws under date of August 12, 1935, Public 269, Seventy-fourth Congress. In the President's statement at the time of approval of the measure he stressed the case of Spanish-American War veterans as being comparable to the Civil War veterans and his action was not a precedent for World War veterans for whom other benefits had been provided. The circumstances surrounding their service and other reasons show that the Spanish-American War group must properly be afforded benefits granted Civil War cases. The President's statement appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senate, volume 79, part 12, page 13033, August 14, 1935.

What is requested by H. R. 2350 is simple justice to these veterans advanced in years and widows who are in need of pensions and are denied although they lived with and cared for the veteran in some cases as long as 15 years. You will note that the marriage date proposed conforms with Civil War, being some-

what more conservative and by fixing the date at January 1, 1938, about 6 years back, no widow could come on the rolls who married the veteran after that date.

Further, the House recently passed H. R. 3356 and H. R. 3377, which provide increased rates for World War No. 1 and the same rates for World War No. 2 veterans and in the case of H. R. 3356 increase is provided for the widows and children of World War No. 1 deceased veterans and the same rates are made to apply to widows and children of deceased World War No. 2 veterans.

At the time of the debate on H. R. 3356 and H. R. 3377 for example, the question was asked as to increases for the veterans and widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection and the China Relief Expedition. This bill (H. R. 2350) was then referred to as the one which would meet this need.

In view of the conservative and equitable provisions of H. R. 2350 and the commitment of the Government to this group, I urge passage of the measure.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it correct that this bill is predicated upon the increased cost of living?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right in part.

Mr. COLE of New York. That being so, I am curious to know why the committee did not make temporary, rather than permanent legislation.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Well, it is to correspond with the legislation for the Civil War veterans at the present time.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. What is the percentage increase? A widow is raised from \$30 to \$40 a month?

Mr. BUCKLEY. From \$30 to \$40, unless she was the wife of a veteran at the time of the war.

Mr. GREEN. The Spanish War veterans are raised from \$65 to \$75?

Mr. BUCKLEY. From \$60 to \$75, the same as Civil War veterans.

Mr. GREEN. That will give the Spanish War veterans and their dependents a similar increase to what we have already granted for the World War veterans.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Yes; exactly the same as the Civil War veterans are getting.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield further to me?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. If the basis of this bill is due to the increased cost of living, why is it that the committee did not consider an adjustment of pensions for Civil War veterans and their widows, who have to bear the increased cost of living proportionately equal to the veterans of any other war?

Mr. BUCKLEY. We did not take into consideration only the increased cost of living. We also took into consideration the fact that the Civil War veterans are getting \$75 a month, and we gave the Spanish War veterans who went into the

war with the same understanding, the same pension.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is there any measure pending before your committee looking toward an adjustment of Civil War pensions due to the increased cost of living?

Mr. BUCKLEY. My committee does not have anything to do with Civil War veterans.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. This is permanent legislation, is it not?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Yes; this is permanent legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The marriage date of wives is advanced from 1922 to 1938?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. And it will go into effect the first of the month immediately after the passage of the measure by both the House and Senate and signing by the President?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I thank the gentleman. As a veteran myself, I am interested in the welfare of veterans of all wars. I want the House to know that I am in wholehearted accord with this bill and my only regret is that it was not brought to the floor before this.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. We recently passed a bill increasing the pension of World War veterans. Is the rate of increase in this bill for Spanish War veterans substantially in line with the increase for World War veterans' pensions?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I should say it is.

Mr. BROOKS. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: The bill refers to veterans reaching the age of 65 under the provisions of the original law. What of these Spanish War veterans under the age of 65?

Mr. BUCKLEY. The average age of Spanish-American War veterans, as I have been informed, is 69 years.

Mr. BROOKS. Are there none at all living under 65 years of age?

Mr. BUCKLEY. There are not very many.

Mr. BROOKS. What about the few who are living?

Mr. BUCKLEY. There are very few.

Mr. BROOKS. Would they get less than \$75?

Mr. BUCKLEY. They would get less, but the average age is 69, as I understand it.

Mr. BROOKS. Suppose they are incapacitated and are under 65?

Mr. BUCKLEY. They are provided for anyway by rates for disability or age. They get \$100 a month if they are required to have an attendant, regardless of their age.

Mr. BROOKS. If the incapacity is non-service-connected, would they receive \$100?

Mr. BUCKLEY. They would receive \$100 if in need of aid and attendance.

Mr. BROOKS. As against \$75, if they are over 65?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I notice by the bill in section 2 you change the marriage date from September 1, 1922, to January 1, 1938. Would the gentleman explain the reason for making that change in the marriage date?

Mr. BUCKLEY. To make this bill conform with the Civil War veterans' law. Their marriage date is about 39 years after the Civil War. The Spanish-American War date now will be about 39 years after the Spanish-American War.

Mr. SPRINGER. And this change, which is proposed in this measure, conforms almost identically with the change which was made in the Civil War marriage date?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Yes. The only change is a reduction in the age limit from 70 years to 65 years for the \$40 rate for widows.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Was I correct in understanding the gentleman to say that the annual cost of this change would be around \$24,500,000?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right, about \$24,349,000 the first year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. For veterans and widows of veterans, both groups?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right; that will take care of all of them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In view of the gentleman's explanation of the last three or four questions submitted, was the controlling factor in arriving at \$75 per month the increase granted veterans of the Civil War or the increase in the cost of living?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Increase in the cost of living accounted for some of it and the other factor was to bring them in line with the treatment given the Civil War veterans.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not want to be too technical about this and I am serious in my question, but if the formula was that because the Civil War veterans had been raised to \$75 a month and we move up to that, it seems to me—and I want to be clear on this—that that is the primary or controlling factor in this particular instance. Am I wrong?

Mr. BUCKLEY. No; the gentleman is not wrong in that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand, of course, that the gentleman's committee did give consideration to the increased cost of living.

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman care to commit himself in advance on his own personal opinion or that of his committee so far as he can with respect to the situation that would prevail if the cost of living continued to rise? Would it be the disposition of the committee to recommend to the House any further increase, this going primarily, I think, to the cost of living? I am not going to press for an answer.

Mr. BUCKLEY. I cannot tell what the policy of the Congress may be in the future in regard to an increase.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I was inquiring as to the committee, but I am not going to press the question because I know it is somewhat out of line with general procedure.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There is not anything in the bill which grants increases to those who have not reached age 65 or who are not incapacitated; is there?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I have been informed there are very few under 65.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I happen to know a few under 65.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Very few; the great majority are over.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I have received more communications with reference to this legislation perhaps than any other from my district, and I am wondering what has happened that the committee was so long in having the bill brought to the floor.

Mr. BUCKLEY. That I cannot answer.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I notice that section 8 provides:

SEC. 8. The \$30 monthly pension payable to widows and former widows under the provisions of section 2 of this act, as amended, shall be increased to \$40 per month when the age of 65 years is attained, and the widow or former widow who was the wife of the soldier, sailor, or marine during the period of his service, as defined in section 2 of this act, shall be paid a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

Does that mean regardless of whether the soldier or sailor had a service-connected disability?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Yes, service connection is not required.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as a minority member of this committee I want to say that our chairman in the interrogations here has covered this bill rather completely, and my statement will be rather brief. I think it is well to keep in mind in matters of this kind that the average age of these veterans of the Spanish-American War is 69. The average age of the widows is 65. I am informed that the Spanish veterans are passing out, are dying, at the rate of over 5,000 a year.

These men were volunteers, regardless of the trials and tribulations of the warfare of that time. The country did issue the call for soldiers to perform a duty and these men responded. They went through some very trying places upon the earth. They had yellow fever to contend with, as I recall, and they had a great deal of trouble with bad meat that made one of the scandals of that day. Many of them came back broken in health.

The committee listened to and gave consideration to all the witnesses interested in this legislation and the committee voted unanimously in favor of the bill. I believe it is reasonable and just. I hope the House this afternoon will see fit to pass favorably upon this legislation.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. As I understand, practically all Spanish-American War veterans are now above age 65; am I right?

Mr. ELLIS. The average is 69.

Mr. JENKINS. That is the average, but there are a very few under 65.

Mr. ELLIS. I should think so.

Mr. JENKINS. That being the case, this bill would apply to practically every Spanish War veteran and increase his pension \$15 a month.

Mr. ELLIS. That is my understanding. I think it involves about 84,000 veterans.

Mr. JENKINS. And under this bill the pensions of the widows are increased only \$10. Is that right?

Mr. ELLIS. That is my understanding; yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Regardless of her age and regardless of what she is drawing now.

Mr. ELLIS. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to inquire in this manner by reason of this coming up at this time and the witnesses having appeared and especially in the light of the fact that the average age of these people is 69 years, what evidence was shown to the committee that \$75 would cover the physical needs of this particular group at this time under today's cost of necessities? Was there any evidence submitted along that line?

Mr. ELLIS. No specific evidence, to my knowledge. It was more or less an arbitrary figure. It was realized and recognized that what they were getting was not sufficiently comfortable to live on today. That was my basis of reasoning on it and it may have been the reasoning of the others, I do not know.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not informed on the Civil War pension matter. What did we pay the Civil War veterans, \$75?

Mr. ELLIS. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The chairman of the committee spoke about this being related to what was paid the Civil War veteran.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the tie-in between this pension of \$75 a month and the amount we paid the Civil War veterans?

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. In answer to the gentleman's inquiry, it is my understanding that we are doing for the Spanish-

American War veterans at their age what we did for the veterans of the Civil War at a like age.

Mr. ELLIS. That is my understanding.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I am trying to confirm. What did we pay those veterans, \$75 a month?

Mr. ELLIS. I will direct that question to the chairman of the committee who, more than likely, has the information.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The question I submit is this: What did we pay the Civil War veterans in the form of pensions at about the average age of 69? Was it \$75 a month?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Seventy-five dollars a month.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That answers my question. Here is what is in my mind. We are having all this veterans' legislation come through here now for review, these sums that are being discussed to be paid men upon being released from the Army, whether they go directly back into a war industry job that pays these fantastically high wages which we are now paying or whether they remain out of a job. I am not protesting. I am trying to get something straight in my own mind. Apparently we are going now into a program which will call for vast sums and increased amounts to be paid to men who have been allied with our military activities. If this is to be somewhat the pattern, I am wondering what \$75 per month will do in the way of giving a fairly decent living to a man with an average age of 69 years on today's basis of the cost of living. That is what is back of my mind, and especially as I relate that proposition to the sums that are being discussed, fixed amounts to a man if he is released from the Army and if he is physically able to go back into a war industry. I am wondering if the gentleman can give me any comfort with respect to that general set of questions.

Mr. ELLIS. That was a rather lengthy question and covered a great field. I think the gentleman is making a worthwhile observation. The gentleman from Wisconsin this afternoon brought very forcibly to our attention that in considering these things we should look at it as an over-all picture with reference to the problems we are going to be faced with in the very near future. I made an observation here awhile ago that it satisfied my own conscience in relation to this: That these men were up in years and that they were dropping off at the rate of five or six thousand a year; so, as for myself, I considered that a problem just alone. When the Second World War comes to us that will be something else.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I am very much in favor of this bill because I think it is long overdue the Spanish-American War veterans. I would like to ask the gentleman some questions that perhaps the hearings have developed. Will the members of the Philippine Scouts who participated in the Philippine Insurrection benefit by this bill?

Mr. ELLIS. I will direct that question to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman will find that answer in line 6, page 1, of the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. It does not say anything about the Philippine Scouts. I am talking about the Philippine Scouts.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman mean those who are natives of the Philippine Islands?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; but in the enlisted forces of the United States Army.

Mr. ELLIS. I am not prepared to answer that question.

Mr. STEFAN. Was anything said about that in the hearings?

Mr. ELLIS. I do not recall.

Mr. STEFAN. The bill is to liberalize the service pensions awarded to veterans of the Spanish War and the Chinese expedition. That is the Boxer Rebellion?

Mr. ELLIS. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Was there anything developed in the hearings regarding the Philippine Constabulary members?

Mr. ELLIS. I do not recall. If my memory serves me correctly, there was not.

Mr. STEFAN. Nothing was said about the Philippine Constabulary members who participated in the Philippine Insurrection. The gentleman cannot clarify my mind about the Philippine Scouts?

Mr. ELLIS. I am sorry, I cannot.

Mr. STEFAN. I am very much in favor of this bill. I would like to talk to the gentleman, sometime off the record about the Philippine Scouts who are very much interested in veterans' bills that we bring on the floor of the House here because they are a part of the armed forces of the United States although most of them are now in the hands of the Japanese.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman may have answered this, but I did not hear it. Has a similar bill to this been passed by the Senate during the present session?

Mr. ELLIS. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. JENKINS. I thought the Senate had.

Mr. ELLIS. I cannot answer the question.

Mr. JENKINS. I understand from the Clerk that the Senate has not passed a companion bill. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his activities with reference to this legislation and I hope it passes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The total amount involved in this bill is about \$30,000,000, as I understand.

Mr. ELLIS. No, my understanding is that it is \$24,500,000.

Mr. DONDERO. This will gradually decrease, of course, as time goes on and the number of veterans grows less.

Mr. ELLIS. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. This is a good bill, in the gentleman's judgment?

Mr. ELLIS. It certainly is.

Mr. DONDERO. It ought to pass. It is the first duty of government to provide for those who bear the brunt of the battles of the nations, and their widows and orphans.

Mr. ELLIS. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to support this bill.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, there is no occasion for a long discussion of this bill. It is short. The Committee on Pensions feels that the bill is entirely justified.

I want to mention something here that has not been mentioned heretofore, I believe, and that is the fact that the Spanish-American War veterans put off this issue as long as they could. They have had it in mind, as I understand, but have put it off. They did not want to send a bill to the House, but the increase in the cost of living and the increasing age of the veterans have forced them to ask for the passage of this bill.

The Committee on Pensions heard various witnesses and voted unanimously to bring this bill to the House.

The bill simply increases the pension of veterans of the Spanish-American War, and the other groups mentioned therein from \$60 to \$75 per month for those who are totally disabled and for those who are not totally disabled if they have reached the age of 65. Note, all totally disabled are advanced to \$75 per month, and all others are advanced to \$75 if they are 65 years of age. That covers nearly all of them, for the average age is 69.

As to the marriage date, that is changed from September 1, 1922, to January 1, 1938. This was done to correspond to pensions to Civil War widows. The delimiting marriage date with reference to Civil War widows was June 27, 1905, about 40 years after the Civil War. This bill fixes the delimiting marriage date for Spanish-American war widows at January 1, 1938, about 40 years after the war was terminated.

As to the widows, I understand all of them are now getting \$30 per month if married to the veteran prior to September 1, 1922. This bill simply increases that amount to \$40 per month, provided they are 65 years of age, and extends the marriage date to January 1, 1938, and if they were the wives of the men while they were in the service they get \$50 per month. This likewise is largely in conformity to the law regulating pensions to Civil War widows. In other words, the bill makes a distinction between the widow who was the wife of the veteran during the war and those married after the war, just as the law does as to Civil War widows.

We submit it is entitled to the unanimous approval of this House. The cost of living has gone up. The veterans and widows of veterans are getting old, and it is felt that this increase is necessary and

deserved by the Spanish-American War veterans and their widows.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] asked several times about the basis of this bill. The bill is based on the fact that these veterans are now of an average age of 69 years, and also upon the increasing cost of living. Many of them are in their seventies. Perhaps very few are below 65. This Nation cannot afford to neglect these veterans. Also, as I have just pointed out, a similar treatment was given Civil War veterans when they were about that age. The Veterans' Administration has stated that the widows are at an average age of 64. Likewise, as I indicated, their treatment in this bill is similar to the treatment accorded widows of Civil War veterans. Your Committee on Pensions has tried to make this bill conform as nearly as possible with what was done for the Civil War veterans.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I wish to ask concerning section 2 of the bill, which relates to the change in the marriage date. Is the effect of changing the date from September 1, 1922, to January 1, 1938, to make eligible for widows' pensions widows who have been unable to establish service connection as a cause for the death of the veteran?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. No; this is not a service-connection bill.

Mr. CASE. Perhaps the gentleman did not get my question. As I understand, in some cases if service connection is shown the widow gets greater pension rights.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Under this bill if the widow is 65 years of age and married the veteran before January 1, 1938, she gets \$40 per month. If she was the wife of the veteran while he was in the service then she gets \$50 per month. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. CASE. I am not entirely sure it does. I was referring not to section 3 but to section 2.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. My understanding is that under the law now widows of Spanish-American War veterans who married the veterans after September 1, 1922, are not paid any pension at all. This bill extends that date to January 1, 1938. The marriage must have taken place before September 1, 1922.

Mr. CASE. If there was not service connection?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That does not alter the situation. The widow must have married the veteran before September 1, 1922, in all cases. Now we bring this down to January 1, 1938, in this bill, which we understand is almost exactly in line with the Civil War situation.

Mr. CASE. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This additional question will come up that we shall have to try to answer. If I understood the gentleman correctly a moment ago, this change in the marriage date was to make the present situation as related to the Spanish-American War veterans very closely conform to the marriage date and the status of the widows of Civil War veterans.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. General Hines told us it was almost the same.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, that is the real reason for changing the marriage date?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That is the reason.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Louisiana, an able member of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. BROOKS. I am sure my colleague has made a long and exhaustive study of this subject. I just had occasion to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation in reference to those veterans who are under the age of 65, does the gentleman believe that this bill adequately cares for them and gives them the increase that we think those above 65 are entitled to?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I think most of them get a pension under the present law. This will help them greatly. This was requested by the Spanish-American War veterans. It is probably the best that can be done now. I am sure these veterans will welcome the benefits under this bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do I understand now that General Hines or the Veterans' Administration recommended the increases and also the change in dates of marriage?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. There is a lengthy letter from General Hines in the hearings. I would not say that he recommends it. That is not usually done. He advises the committees having to do with such legislation as to the facts and leaves the other to the legislative branch of the Government. But I will say this, that the date, January 1, 1938, as I recall, was fixed because of the testimony of General Hines. In other words, he testified that that was in line with the Civil War situation, and that is why it was fixed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Veterans' Administration did not in any way oppose the legislation?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. They simply took the position that it was not in line with the President's program as they often do with reference to bills.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman go so far as to say that the Veterans' Administration supported the legislation?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. No; not specifically. I think the Veterans' Administration took a position similar to what it has taken in many other bills. They rec-

ognize it is a matter for the legislative branch of the Government to pass on.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. But the whole thing is this: If we want to put these people on a parity with what was done for the Civil War veterans a good many years ago, then we owe this to the Spanish-American War veterans and widows of Spanish-American War veterans.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Of course, the gentleman now is referring to age, marriage date, and dollar volume of pensions, is he not?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Well; yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, I think the gentleman will agree with me that \$75 per month today to a veteran of the average age of 65, will not bring what \$75 would bring a veteran of an average age of 65, say 20 years ago?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That is a matter of elementary knowledge, I will say, to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, the bill under debate, H. R. 2350, proposes to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents. The Committee on Pensions has conducted hearings on the proposal and after careful study has recommended its enactment. I understand, however, that opposition to its passage has arisen and this causes me to rise to urge strongly on the Members of this House that they adhere to the recommendation of the committee and vote for its enactment.

Briefly, the bill proposes to increase the rate of pension payable to veterans of the Spanish War and other military operations of this country. The provisions of the bill require age 65 or total disability to entitle veterans to \$75 per month.

Section 2 of the bill eliminates present inequalities by delimiting the marriage date for service pension to widows, defining the date as January 1, 1938.

Section 3 provides for a reasonable increase of widows' service pension from \$30 to \$40 per month at 65 years of age and grants \$50 per month to the widow who was the wife of the veteran during his war service.

That these increases are justified, or rather demanded, is apparent. It is now 45 years after the war, and the veterans and their widows are advanced in age and in most cases unable to work. The other factor that makes favorable action imperative is the fact the living costs have greatly increased for the people who would benefit without any corresponding increase in income. The letters which I have received from my constituents have testified to the fact that the increases proposed are necessary if

the recipients are to cope with higher prices.

Public attention has recently become belatedly aware that there are great numbers of our people who, because their income has not increased, have been severely squeezed by mounting costs. I have repeatedly pointed out that these people, because not organized for the purpose of forcing attention to their needs, have been cruelly sacrificed before organized pressure groups and the inevitable inflation which has devaluated our purchasing power, dollar for dollar.

Not the least among these numbers are the recipients of pension payments, which are the just recognition of all the people of services rendered by men who defended our country in her past wars. They are particularly affected because their advanced age makes it impossible for them to capitalize on opportunities for offsetting decreased purchasing power which are available to most others.

Congress, together with the Nation as a whole, is now taking steps to assure adequate financial assistance for our present fighting men as they return from the war. We all acknowledge that this is as it should be. Moreover, present events have focused our attention on the necessity of bolstering and extending certain benefits to veterans of World War No. 1 and their dependents. Several bills have passed the House recently making such provisions.

Consequently, it is manifest that we would be acting from other motives than recognition of need and acknowledgment of indebtedness if we failed to support the provisions of the measure now under consideration. I have testimony sufficient to satisfy me that the need exists, in the letters which I have received. The United Spanish War Veterans of Lynn, Mass., of Revere, Mass., of Peabody, Mass., as well as their auxiliaries, acting independently, have through their commanders, impressed me with the need for the enactment of H. R. 2350. The need patently exists; why then do we hesitate?

Perhaps some may doubt then of our indebtedness to these veterans. But are not these men veterans in the full sense of the term? Did they not fight in our country's cause? Does the passage of time forgive our responsibility? Our fighting men today would have cause for concern if we confessed this. I am inclined to believe that our indebtedness is more closely associated to the need that exists than to the mere passage of time.

But we have a more definite obligation even than this. Mr. Harry B. Hershey, national chairman of the Allied Veterans' Association reminds me that "when the Spanish War broke out a definite promise was made that the Spanish War veterans would receive pension rights under the same policy and in like manner as were granted to the veterans of the Civil War and their dependents." H. R. 2350 provides for just that. The responsibility is clear and I am confident that the majority of the members

will acknowledge their awareness of that responsibility.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 2350, which liberalizes the service-pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, the China Relief Expedition, and their widows. It is a genuine pleasure to me to have an opportunity to speak and vote for this measure and I trust that there will not be a single vote cast against it.

When I came to Congress years ago, I sought and was given a place on the Pensions Committee of the House, and I helped to write and report favorably the bill that became the act of June 2, 1920. This measure granted a service pension to all veterans who had served 90 days or more between April 1898 and July 1902, with an honorable discharge, and I have voted for each and every measure to increase the pensions of Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and China Relief Expedition veterans. The last bill we passed granted a pension of \$60 per month to these veterans who were totally and permanently disabled, and if they were not permanently and totally disabled they would get \$60 per month when they attained the age of 65. Section I of H. R. 2350 increases this pension to \$75 per month to veterans of both of these groups, those totally disabled, and also those who have reached the age of 65. I might say in passing that the average age of the Spanish War veterans now is 69 years, and in view of the increased cost of living and their advancing years, they need and should be granted this increase. There are now 85,140 of such veterans on the rolls. This will entail an additional cost of \$15,286,000 the first year. I am grieved to say, however, that these fine veterans are dying by the thousands every year, and the cost will be diminished from year to year. This does not repeal the present law granting pensions of \$100 per month to those requiring the regular aid and attendance of another person.

Our Pension Committee of the House reported out a bill, and I had charge of it on the floor of the House, granting pensions to the widows of Spanish War veterans, which became the act of September 1, 1922, and under the present law no widow of a Spanish War veteran can secure a pension unless she married the veteran before September 1, 1922. Section II of this bill advances the marriage date to January 1, 1938, and therefore the widows of these veterans who married prior to January 1, 1938 will be entitled to a pension. The Veterans' Administration estimates that there are approximately 4,000 widows and remarried widows of veterans who married after September 1, 1922, and before January 1, 1938, who will be entitled to pensions. If all of these apply and are granted pensions, this will add \$1,642,000 per year. I might also say that our pension committee reported out a bill increasing the pensions of Spanish War veterans and their dependents 66 2/3 percent, and I had charge of that bill on the floor of the House. It became the act of May 1, 1926. On a roll call this bill received every

vote cast in the House, and on a roll call in the Senate it received every vote cast. Under the present laws the widows and former widows of Spanish War veterans receive \$30 per month. The bill before us amends the act of May 1, 1926, and grants a pension of \$40 per month to all Spanish War widows and former widows when they have attained the age of 65 years, and if such widow was the wife of the soldier, sailor, or marine while he was in the service, she is entitled to receive a pension of \$50 per month when she attains the age of 65 years. The total increased expense to the Government of this legislation is estimated at \$24,349,000. In view of the high cost of living and the increase in the ages of these veterans and their widows, these increases are not only just but they are necessary in order to enable the veterans and their widows to support themselves. I have said many times on the floor of the House and Senate that this great Republic should never permit its defenders and their dependents to become the objects of public charity, and I have also said many times one of the best investments for national defense is the grateful acknowledgment of the Congress and the Nation to our defenders and their dependents of the heroic, courageous and patriotic service the veterans have rendered to our country. This bill refers to the act of 1930. I helped to pass that bill as a member of the Senate over the President's veto.

It has been my pleasure to vote for measures that are helpful to our soldiers, sailors, and marines in the present great war. They are doing a magnificent job on land, sea, and in the air, and they will, as their fathers have done before, bring victory to our country, and I am very happy today that the House of Representatives by the passage of this bill will show to those who are now defending us, and the Spanish War veterans that the Congress and the Nation have not forgotten the heroic and valiant services of the veterans of the Spanish-American War. Some days ago we passed some bills in the House to increase the compensations and pensions of the veterans of World War No. 1. We must never forget those who are now defending us and those who have gone out and won our other wars. We may do too little, but we cannot do too much for the men and women who offer their lives and who give their lives or their health to preserve and protect this great Nation.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill (H. R. 2350). I think the tenor shown here today is such that the bill will pass, and I think it should, in justice to two particular factors: Unity of treatment compared with Civil War veterans, and the rise in the cost of living.

I want to divert for just a moment to give my idea on pensions in general.

Pensions to veterans and dependents are usually based on a carefully considered amount designed to barely cover

the necessities of life. Pensions are static in dollar units. Necessities of life constantly vary in dollar units. It seems to me that an adequate pension at a certain period becomes an inadequate pension 5, 10, or 15 years later. That is why it is necessary, from time to time, for these bills to come to the floor for revision. The cost of living has gone up 26 percent since 1939 and because of that fact \$60 to a Spanish-American War veteran of 4 years ago, only buys today \$44.40 worth of groceries and clothes. When that pension was originally set here, it was set for the purpose of providing a standard of living for these worthy people. That standard has risen and it has fallen as the prices in the commodity index of the necessities of life goes up and down. A \$40 pension of a widow 4 years ago, would buy \$40 worth of food and clothing and today it will only buy \$29.60 worth of commodities. So, in effect, this increase is just restoring to them the purchasing power of the dollar of a few years ago.

I believe that a scientific approach to the whole question of pensions could be made. I think a commission could be set up—it may already exist—whose duty would be to gear pensions to a certain standard of living which we think commensurate with the needs involved at the time of the passage of the act. A revision of dollar units could be made every 2 or 3 years, by this impartial commission, in order to maintain this standard of living, as geared to the recognized commodity index. Then these different bills, coming up many times after 10 or 15 years of discouragement on the part of the veterans, would be unnecessary. There would be an automatic lifting and falling of dollar units, and the general standard of living would be maintained throughout the period of the veteran's dependency upon those benefits.

I trust that this pension bill—H. R. 2350—in its present form will be passed. I am heartily in support of it. The veterans and widows of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition are in dire need of this additional allowance on their pensions.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal of interest in this legislation and I have had a great deal of correspondence about it. The South Dakota State Soldiers' Home is located at Hot Springs, S. Dak., in my district, as is Battle Mountain Sanitarium, a facility of the Veterans' Administration. Veterans of the Spanish-American War are found at both places and widows of veterans are members of the State Soldiers' Home.

Thinking of them calls to mind the resentment that these people feel at a term that was used in Public, No. 144, a law that was passed last summer. The term was "inmate." These good people rightly feel that the term "member" should be used for the membership of homes that are established in gratitude for service rendered. The term "inmate" is more properly used for institutions of a penal or corrective nature.

The use of the term in Public, No. 144, was particularly unfortunate because of the legal interpretations that have been placed upon it, for it has resulted in a reduction of pensions for some members who were away from the Home on an extended furlough trying to help farmers handle their summer's crops. They certainly had no notice that their absence on an unannounced day would have such an effect. And they certainly had no idea that the Federal Government would penalize them for trying to do their bit. In fact, Congress had waived penalties on recipients of old-age assistance, if they supplemented their meager allowances by trying to do a few farm chores or help with haying.

Yet the mere incident that they were not in the home upon the particular day that the law was approved by the President resulted in reducing their pension from \$60 to \$20 per month. That was the first interpretation given the act.

Subsequently the solicitor for the Veterans' Administration advises me, a 30-day furlough was recognized as not destroying the veteran's membership in the home, but that 30-day period expired in mid-July, still penalizing the Spanish War veteran who had taken a 60- or 90-day furlough.

I may say that I have discussed the matter with the solicitor and am hoping that this matter can be cleared up by reconstructing the act in accord with what I believe was the intent of Congress. For certainly I do not believe that any Member of the Congress intended that any such discrimination should result. Indeed I think that the Veterans' Administration has no such policy, and that the matter can be adjusted by reinterpretation of the act.

It is customary, I am informed, to recognize 90 days as the logical period for a trial visit to which a veteran is entitled when he seeks to determine his ability to maintain himself before receiving a final discharge from facilities within the direct jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration.

The same 90-day rule should be applied to State soldiers' homes or other facilities recognized by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill increasing the amount to the veterans and their dependents, and regret that it has been so long delayed.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCOWEN].

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, H. R. 2350. I have had many letters from veterans and widows of veterans urging the passage of this bill. They are in great need because of the increase in the cost of living. Many of them are getting along in years, need medical and other attention because of advanced age and illness. It is highly important that financial help by increased pensions be given now before it is too late.

As a general rule it would be utterly impossible to, even in a small way, compensate deserving soldiers for the great service they have rendered our country. Pensions are no attempt to compensate for services. They are, however, for the main purpose, to prevent the defenders of our country from becoming dependents and to guarantee them from want.

Although the United States has been fairly generous in pensions at times and very miserly at other times in its laws for pensions, yet it is my opinion that pensions are even yet entirely too small.

I urge the immediate passage of this bill.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this measure. I think it should have the whole-hearted support of the membership of the House. I would like especially to ask a question or two of the chairman of the committee. With respect to section 8, which provides for an increase to the widows of Spanish-American veterans, under the proposed legislation, a provision is contained that the widow or former widow, who was the wife of a soldier, sailor, or marine, during the period of his service, as defined in section 2 of this act, shall be paid a pension at the rate of \$50 per month. Directing my question to the chairman of the committee—does that mean that the widow of a soldier or sailor who was the wife at the time of his service, shall be entitled to draw \$50 a month, regardless of any disability or regardless of service connection or nonservice connection? That seems to be the point that some of the members have some doubt about.

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is, the widow of a soldier or sailor or marine who was the wife of such soldier, sailor, or marine at the time of his service will be entitled to draw a pension at the rate of \$50 a month, regardless of any other circumstances?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to thank the gentleman for clearing up that point. It is my considered opinion that the interpretation placed upon that provision contained in the bill is correct, and such an interpretation should prevail respecting this particular provision of this measure in its application, after passage.

With respect to the veterans themselves, after they reach the age of 65—and I assume that practically all the Spanish-American War veterans have now reached or will very soon reach age 65—they will be entitled to receive \$75 per month instead of the \$60 per month that is now provided by law, and, as I understand, that is regardless of any service-connected disability.

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. But it is required that they have a total disability in order to receive that sum; is that correct?

Mr. BUCKLEY. They must be suffering either from total disability or have reached age 65.

Mr. SPRINGER. Total disability is required if a veteran is under 65?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. But it is not if he is over 65?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Yes; that is entirely correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. Either one of these conditions would bring him within the classification so he could draw the \$75 per month?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to compliment the committee on bringing out this legislation. As I understand it, the average age of the Spanish-American War veterans is 69 years and that there are now approximately 84,000 of them in this country. They will all, or practically all, come within the provisions of this measure. As I have said repeatedly on the floor of the House, these men are veterans of one of our major wars, and veterans of all of our wars must be amply taken care of. These men of the Spanish-American War having attained an average age of 69 years—and some of them I know particularly in my State and my district are now over 75 years of age, many are totally disabled, entirely incapacitated—are having a hard struggle; they are largely dependent upon the old-age assistance provided by the States. They are hardly able to live under those circumstances. Those men who have fought our battles and who have stood on the battle fronts and have faced the enemy bullets should be taken care of when they attain the age at which they are incapable of self-support.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this legislation will be passed unanimously by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] as he may require.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, it is altogether too easy to lose sight of the great service rendered by the veterans of the Spanish-American War and of the hardships they endured. They have earned many times over what this legislation proposes, and I favor its passage.

Forty-five years is a long time, and recollections of the Spanish-American War are growing dim and indistinct. Many, if not most of the Members of the Congress have grown up to active and useful manhood since that war was fought. But my old friends who had a part in those stirring days of 1898 have indelibly impressed their importance upon me.

I have been told that this is the only war engaged in by the United States in which the Army was a purely volunteer organization. There was no conscription or selective service. No man served against his wishes. The Nation was just emerging as a world power and patriotism flamed hot.

The response to President McKinley's call to arms was prompt and enthusiastic, and the power of once mighty Spain was quickly crushed by American naval and land action. But health hazards were overcome with less ease, and many

a Spanish War veteran went to an early grave or carries today the crippling effects of that service. Medical and sanitary services were poor by comparison with any present-day standard. Tents and cots were often lacking, and the only shelter was a blanket spread on the ground.

Today's rations are well balanced, ample, and well-cooked. In 1898 the soldiers often subsisted for days on fried sowbelly, potatoes, and coffee. Yet those old timers did not kick about conditions under which they lived. They did not enlist expecting a picnic. And those who are still alive are glad that Uncle Sam gives his boys the splendid care they receive today.

The veterans of '98 are old now. They need the additional help provided in this measure—and they have earned it. Since the Mexican War a century ago, the United States has fought four major wars. Only from the Spanish War did we emerge financially stronger than when we entered. From the Spanish War we emerged a world power. From any standpoint it is far from being an unimportant struggle, and we should not withhold adequate recognition and reward from the veterans who saw it through.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this bill. It will make up a portion of the difference between the cost of living and the meager allowances now given Spanish-American War veterans and their dependents. It should have been passed long ago and should carry greater increases. I trust the vote for passage of the bill may be unanimous.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the Record in regard to the death of a distinguished Mississippian, my remarks to appear immediately following those of my colleague from Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRIFFITHS].

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, having attended the hearings on the bill, I am wholeheartedly in support of it and favor its passage.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, fixed incomes have to be kept in adequate relationship to living costs. Certainly the pensions of our Spanish-American

War veterans are out of date and should be increased.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JEFFREY].

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Chairman, the third district of Ohio is the home of one of the very large veterans' facilities in this country. It has been my privilege to talk and correspond with many veterans of the Spanish-American War as well as others who are cared for by the provisions of this bill. There could be no question but that the present allowance is wholly inadequate for the essential needs of many of these men who so ably served their country. The amount which is allotted by this bill is not too great but it will nevertheless serve to ameliorate the hardships which exist for many of these men today. It is a measure that is badly needed and deserves the support of the Members of this Congress.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting a long time to see this bill brought to the floor. I am glad that at last it is here. There are many veterans of the Spanish-American War and widows of such veterans in my district, the Twentieth District of California. Also, there are veterans and widows of former members of the China Expeditionary Force. I am sure that the people of my district as a whole want to see these valiant men still living adequately, and indeed lovingly, cared for, as they wish to care for the widows of those who have passed to the Great Beyond.

It will be a particular pleasure for me to cast the vote of my district for this highly meritorious bill.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my wholehearted support of H. R. 2350, a bill to liberalize the service pensions of Spanish-American War veterans and their dependents.

This bill, which comes to the House with the recommendation of the Committee on Pensions, provides modest and reasonable increases in the pensions payable to these veterans and their widows. This adjustment is necessary to compensate for the increased cost of living and, in my opinion, is long overdue.

The average age of these veterans, I am informed, is 69 years. Most of them are unemployable and are completely dependent on their small pensions for a livelihood. Failure to pass this legislation would result in hardship and suffering for countless Americans, who fought for their country in the War with Spain.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of simple justice to these veterans and their dependents, I urge the unanimous approval of this bill.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I need hardly take the time of the Committee to explain that I favor this legislation and hope for its passing here today without opposition and its soon enactment by the other body. With my own flesh and blood mixed and mingled in this present desperate global struggle and with all my young friends staking their lives and their uttermost efforts on the outcome of the present war, it might seem that I would be unable to give thought to a war that happened so long ago. However, I am of such an age that I can remember those who first "remembered the Maine." I can personally recall the stirring episode of those days.

Many in Arizona yet living can recall that three companies of Rough Riders were organized within the State of Arizona to help Theodore Roosevelt in his brilliant exploits in Cuba. Before the courthouse in Prescott, Ariz., there stands a monument of a dashing figure on horseback placed there not only as a monument to Bucky O'Neil, who was captain of one of the three companies of Rough Riders, but it stands also as a monument to all the Rough Riders furnished by Arizona. Their names are on the bronze tablet on this monument. Capt. Bucky O'Neil lost his life in a charge up San Juan Hill and is buried, not in Prescott, Ariz., but in Arlington, just across the river from this Chamber.

The Spanish-American War was of comparatively brief duration, but of great significance. It marked a turning point in American history. It is good to see the spirit exemplified here today in remembering those who "remembered the Maine," and in attempting to reward their services rendered more than four decades ago, and to deal out to them now a substantial increase of compensation to meet the rising cost of living. We are thinking both of today and yesterday.

Earlier today the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman BARDEN, indicated that he was introducing a bill designed to help the young men now in the armed services of our country whose education has been interrupted, or may later be interrupted by their induction into the services. I sought that information and assurance of the gentleman from North Carolina, and am mentioning it now that my young friends in uniform may see that I am thinking of them and of their future as befits an educator. At the same time I am supporting this legislation to mitigate the evils of inflation and the rising cost of living for the oldsters of an earlier war.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON].

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a few minutes of the time allotted to this bill, which I am heartily in accord with, to briefly outline my plan to solve the Japanese problem.

We have heard a great deal of discussion in the past few weeks about the outrages in the various Japanese camps out in California. Those problems are only transitory although they are serious.

When the war is over the Japanese camps will be disbanded and Japanese will to a great extent go back to their former places of abode. We want to find some way, if we can, to take care of the situation that will confront us at that time.

In view of the statement of the Attorney General the other day before the Dies committee that it is possible to denationalize a citizen, and then deport him, I want to briefly outline the plan that was presented by myself in two pieces of legislation filed with the Clerk of the House last June. My plan contemplates the deportation of all alien Japanese and also the deportation of all Japanese-American citizens who after a public hearing before a commission or court, shall have been declared to have been disloyal during the course of the war.

The underlying idea is this: In the first place over 40 years' experience with the Japanese shows that they cannot be assimilated. Every Western State has a law prohibiting their intermarriage with whites. In 40 years' experience with these people in our country, there is not 1 percent that have ever been assimilated by intermarriage. Furthermore, I am assuming, and I know you are, that we will win the war with Japan so conclusively that at the termination of the war we will be in a position to sit down and write the kind of treaty we want.

My plan provides that by a resolution the House of Representatives and the Senate state as their conclusion and their opinion that in any treaty with Japan it shall contain, among other provisions, a provision that every Japanese-American citizen who has been found by a court or other public body after a public hearing, in which all the rights of the citizen are safeguarded, to have been disloyal during the course of the war, he shall be deported, and also that all alien Japanese shall be deported.

To implement this provision of the treaty, I provide for the creation of a deportation commission consisting of three persons appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. It shall be their duty to review the cases of all these Japanese. Their records are now in the W. R. A., the F. B. I., and in numerous other places. It has been stated publicly that thousands of them in these camps have refused to take the oath of allegiance to the United States of America. Some of them have asked to be sent back to Japan. This commission shall hold hearings, give the person involved notice, allow him to be present with his lawyer, submit testimony, and have all the rights of a litigant in court. After this commission has heard the evidence, it shall make a finding as to their loyalty. If they are found, by the evidence, to have been disloyal, the commission shall make that finding and also a finding that they shall be deported. There shall be no appeal from the finding of fact in this regard, but the person

involved will have the right of appeal on questions of law and the right of writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States to review the legality and the constitutionality of the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. The gentleman is making a very timely statement. I would like to make the observation that it is my opinion, and almost the unanimous opinion of the people of the State of California, that now the Japanese are out of California, we want them to stay out of California permanently. I want to commend the gentleman for the very splendid statement he is making.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I do not think we should disregard the rights of any citizen. We should ferret out all the bad ones and get rid of them. Now is the time, when we are writing a treaty, to incorporate that in the treaty, ship them back to Japan, and that will largely solve the problem.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I say to the gentleman I find that that is the sentiment in my State. I think the gentleman has correctly presented it and has given us a good plan under which to operate.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I would like to have the gentleman repeat what the Attorney General held, because it is uppermost in my mind whether we can strip a native-born Japanese, and I have no sympathy for any one of them, from the right of birth. How can we deport anybody who has been born in this country and where are you going to deport them?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I have not read the exact statement of the Attorney General but it was reported by various persons and especially by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] on the floor of the House that the Attorney General had stated that we could denationalize the Japanese, and he recommended another bill which provides for this matter. If the Japanese-American citizen is denationalized then when we are writing our treaty, if it includes the provision I recommend in my resolution, we can, by virtue of this treaty provision, direct Japan to take the persons whom we designate. The key to the problem is that after compelling Japan to accept unconditional surrender we can submit a treaty which she must accept. In this treaty will be provided that those persons whom we designate must be taken back to Japan. If a person who has been disloyal to us and loyal to Japan—as many of the Japanese, both aliens

and American citizens because of their birth here, have been—during this war with Japan cannot be denationalized it seems that we are pretty impotent. But I am firmly convinced from my investigation and from what the Attorney General said that this very thing can be done. Our treaty will give us the one opportunity that we will have to get rid of these disloyal and troublesome Japanese, and even Mr. Meyer of the W. R. A. admits that there are many thousands of them.

Also, as far as I am concerned, I want this matter handled by a commission that can do it quickly. If we get bogged down in cumbersome legal machinery we will be years or even generations in getting the job done, if the Harry Bridges deportation case is a criterion. The commission shall hold the public hearing, make a finding, and in the appropriate cases order deportation and from this finding of fact as to loyalty there shall be no appeal. The same general type of procedure is utilized by the California Railroad Commission in rate cases and by the Industrial Accident Commission in industrial accident cases, and those bodies are noted for their even-handed justice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the legislation now before the House. Speaking in behalf of the veterans residing in San Francisco, I sincerely hope this bill will pass unanimously.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I have waited a long time to have the opportunity to vote for this bill, H. R. 2350, to increase the pensions of the Spanish War veterans from \$60 to \$75 a month where I think they should have been long ago. It is a happy commentary upon the record of this House that in the midst of another great war, the greatest war history has ever known, we are able to pause for a moment and give those veterans of the Spanish War and of other wars their just dues.

I hope that within the next few weeks we shall have arrived at a point where we can pass legislation which will pave the way for a perfect rehabilitation and reeducation of the veterans of our present war.

I congratulate the Committee on Military Affairs on the work they have been doing, but I submit to them that we have a long way to go in this House before we do right by the boys in the service. We have roughly three groups of men who will be mustered out of the service. I ask, what are you going to do with the men, probably at least a million of them, who will want to return to agriculture in the same capacity they occupied before the war? They owned their own farms and were able to operate them in an inde-

pendent manner. We must make it possible for them to acquire property and new farm lands.

Then there is another group. What are you going to do with those who want to learn skilled or vocational trades? Let us make it possible for them to study and follow these trades and skills after the war.

There is another group of at least 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 men out of the 12,000,000 who will surely be mustered out by the end of the war or shortly afterward. They have the right to expect we will permit them to continue their basic and general studies after the war.

Last but not least, what are you going to do with those hundreds of thousands of young men who left in the middle of their advanced education, in many cases, or in many other cases had not even started their education? What are you going to do with that vast group that will be trying after the war for a more complete understanding so that they may be assisted to equip themselves for peacetime pursuits?

I ask the House, What are you going to do with all these thousands of men who will want to take their place once more in the sun after peace has been declared? What plans will we make for them outside of simple mustering-out pay, which will only start them upon the road to recovery? That is the most pressing problem of the hour and one which must be met by every one of us.

As I cast my vote with great satisfaction for raising the pensions of the Spanish War veterans, I cannot help but look into the future and hope this Congress will prepare the way of the new veteran in the same considerate manner.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FURLONG].

Mr. FURLONG. Mr. Chairman, I wish to go on record as supporting and voting for this bill (H. R. 2350) for the following reasons:

The veterans of the United States of America who served in the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and China Relief Expedition had, besides the various warriors, the unseen enemy to contend with, not only for that time but for all time after in his life.

Malaria, yellow fever, typhus, typhoid, and other diseases for which the medical profession had no cure at that time, left their marks of wear and tear which affect these veterans today.

Besides, the hardtack and "canned willie" they had to eat did not supply all their bodies needed to carry on the campaigns.

On top of all this it took a real patriotic American to fight for his country at \$9, \$13, or \$16.80 per month, the last amount being paid for overseas duty. At the above figures the boys could not save much for the days after they were mustered out.

Nearly all the Spanish-American War veterans have reached and passed the age of 65 years; they are no longer able to go out and do a day's work that would

pay them enough to keep them and their families in food, clothing, and shelter.

In the passing of this bill, this House of Representatives will be doing an act of justice not only to the veterans and their families, and the widows, but will be proving to the world that America will and does look after the ones who look after the United States of America.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, to no group in our population has the rising cost of living done more harm than to those living on small fixed incomes. Among those that have been especially hard hit have been the veterans of the Spanish-American War, and their wives and widows. The bill under consideration this afternoon, H. R. 2350, is a big step in remedying this situation, in view of the fact that it increases from \$60 a month to \$75 a month the pension for total disability to veterans of this war, as well as those of the Philippine Insurrection and the China Relief Expedition.

I feel certain, Mr. Chairman, that there will be little if any opposition to this measure; all of us are anxious to see justice done, and this bill provides for such justice to thousands of American citizens. Certainly while we are passing huge appropriation bills for the present war, we should not forget those who incurred disability fighting for our country in the wars of the past. I shall vote for this bill with enthusiasm, convinced as I am that it is just and fair and fills a genuine need.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill being considered before Congress today, in my opinion is one of the most important bills to come before the House, since I was elected to serve in this body 6 years ago. We all know that the death rate of the Spanish-American and World War veterans is increasing daily, and within a few years we will only have a few widows of the Spanish-American veterans to pay tribute and, in my opinion, we should do something for these veterans while they are living and can enjoy a few years without worrying about their next meal.

I can think of no better Christmas present to give the Spanish-American War veterans than for the House and Senate to pass the pending bill and send it to the White House for the signature of the President before January 1.

I think the section of the bill relating to the raising of the date for Spanish-American War veterans' widows to be entitled to a pension, is certainly entitled to serious consideration of the House. Personally I do not believe that 1 percent of the wives of Spanish-American veterans married their husbands for a pension and I do not believe that the American womanhood would stoop to anything of this nature. I can see no reason why we should crucify 99 percent of the widows in order to keep 1 percent from doing a wrong act. I can assure

the Spanish-American veterans and widows that it was a pleasure for me to have my bill incorporated in the Buckley bill so that we would only have one bill before the House for consideration. It is my sincere hope that the House will pass this bill without a single dissenting vote.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this act the \$60 monthly rate of pension payable for total disability to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition under section 1 of the act of June 2, 1930 (46 Stat. 492; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 365), and the \$60 monthly rate of pension payable to such veterans upon reaching the age of 65 years under the provisions of section 1 of the act of May 24, 1938 (52 Stat. 440; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 370), are hereby increased to \$75.

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of May 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 382; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 364a), wherein for pension purposes, as to the widow of any deceased veteran of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, the marriage date is defined as September 1, 1922, is hereby amended, effective the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this act, by striking out the date "September 1, 1922" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "January 1, 1938."

SEC. 3. The act of May 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 382-384; U. S. C., title 38, secs. 364-364f), is hereby amended, effective the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this act, by adding a new section thereto No. 8, to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. The \$30 monthly pension payable to widows and former widows under the provisions of section 2 of this act, as amended, shall be increased to \$40 per month when the age of 65 years is attained, and the widow or former widow who was the wife of the soldier, sailor, or marine during the period of his service, as defined in section 2 of this act, shall be paid a pension at the rate of \$50 per month."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COFFEE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2350) to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents, pursuant to House Resolution 376, reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to ex-

tend their own remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a news release.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein various letters and material, and further to extend my own remarks and include therein a letter from a constituent of mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed at the conclusion of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CARE OF WORLD WAR VETERANS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I came to the House of Representatives 13 years ago, when this body was so nearly equally divided between the two major political parties that a small group of Members, consisting of perhaps five or six who did not claim allegiance to either of the regular political parties, held the balance of power.

At that time there was in office in Washington a Republican administration; that is, a Republican President. I served my first 2 years under that distinguished American, then President of the United States, Mr. Herbert Hoover, and I have since that time occupied a seat in this House. During that entire time, as far as I now know, I have never in a single instance deliberately or knowingly made any remark calculated to cast reflection or unfair criticism upon one of my colleagues, and if I shall live to stay here until my hair, already partially gray, becomes entirely gray, I do not believe I ever shall, and I hope I will not.

I have asked for this time for the purpose of responding to some rather grave accusations and some rather peppery criticisms that have been cast upon the House Committee on Military Affairs and upon me personally, as well as upon the administration.

On November 11 the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] who, I am happy to say, is on the floor of the House at this time, made a rather lengthy speech in the course of which he undertook to demonstrate and did say that the conduct of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, meaning myself, and the conduct of the committee as a whole, had been to play politics with the interests of the veterans of our wars. Such a charge is without foundation in fact. He designated it as an act of shame. Evidently I could not afford to allow such charges as that to go unanswered and it is my purpose this afternoon to answer as nearly as I may be able to do so today, the accusations made by my distinguished colleague, to whose youth and inexperience I attribute his words rather than to any intent to be discourteous to a colleague. I have lived almost 69 years. I had 35 years of active law practice before I came to Congress. I became a member of the bar 46 years ago. I have been here 13 years. I believe here, now, as I have always believed, that "there is so much good in the worst of us and so much bad in the best of us, that it hardly behooves any of us to talk about the rest of us." I realize, too, as I hope my young colleague from Missouri does, that this is a parliamentary body that is the spokesman and representative of the great common mass of the people of this country, about whose way of life we talk so much, and that if and when the time comes that this great institution of government has become crippled, discredited, or has lost its usefulness by losing its standing among the masses of the American people then parliamentary government upon this earth will be at an end. Consequently I want to report to you this afternoon, my colleagues, something about what your Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives has been trying to do with reference to the rights and interests of our fighting men in this war in particular and in other wars as well.

I shall repeat here briefly what I have written out as a general statement of the achievements of the Congress, and when I read this, my imagination goes back to the times when I have been able, a few times in my career, to travel over the country and visit some of the great veterans' hospitals with the American flag flying over them and realize in its chambers and in its beds that there were hundreds and thousands of veterans of all our wars being cared for because an American House of Representatives was a liberal institution with a conscience attuned to humanity. We have not hesitated to open the doors of the great hospitals a grateful Nation has erected for the comfort and care of those brave men who in all our illustrious history as a

Nation have carried and are now carrying the Stars and Stripes to a glorious victory over the enemies of freedom. God grant that we shall never permit them to knock in vain upon a door of mercy that should always be open to them. Here are some of the things we have done.

Attention is invited to the fact that the mustering-out pay bill is but a part of a broad program of relief for veterans and the dependents of veterans of the present war. Congress has already enacted legislation providing for life insurance, hospitalization and domiciliary care, disability and death pensions, 6 months' death gratuity, protection under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, vocational rehabilitation and training for those suffering from disability incurred in, or aggravated by, military service, when such disability results in a vocational handicap preventing reemployment, reemployment rights under the Selective Training and Service Act, as amended, maternity care for the wives and infants of enlisted men, preference to employment in the civil service, and burial and funeral expenses including burial in national cemeteries. In addition, the President has recommended to the Congress that legislation be enacted, first, to provide for the education and training of members of the armed forces and the merchant marine after their discharge or conclusion of service; second, to give insurance credits under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act for military service; and third, to provide unemployment allowances for members of the armed forces after their demobilization.

Now, let me get down to the point of stating to you what it was that impelled me to come to the floor of this House for the purpose of answering these charges. My genial young friend and colleague the gentleman from Missouri, on the 11th day of last month, Armistice Day, if you please, addressing this House, criticized the President severely and went to the extent of calling the depression of 1933 the Roosevelt depression, when, as a matter of fact, when Roosevelt came into office, more than 10,000 banks had closed their doors throughout this country, and it was necessary for the Congress to pass a resolution authorizing the President of the United States to close the banks automatically until he ordered them opened up again. My vote for that resolution was my first vote in Congress. My next one was for the veterans.

That was not the fault of Herbert Hoover or the Republican Party. That was the fault of another great world catastrophe that started in August 1914, when Germany undertook to subjugate the world, and ended on the 11th day of November 1918, known as the First World War, plus other economic considerations that entered into the picture.

Now, after denominating that the Roosevelt depression, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] proceeded to take up the President and castigate

him from that day up to this. He then chastised the leadership of the House of Representatives, which, of course, means the Speaker and the floor leader, and included in that a considerable peppery rebuke for the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, and that committee, which he says has been playing politics in reference to the rights of these veterans.

Now, I would like to yield for 15 seconds to any Republican member of the House Military Affairs Committee who is on the floor of this House, and let him—not the Democratic side of it—say whether or not the House Military Affairs Committee has ever in any instance resorted to any political methods to do anything, either in the war effort, or otherwise. I hear no denial.

I wonder if I could hear a voice substantiating that charge, of political activity, made by the gentleman from Missouri. No voice is heard.

Now the gentleman from Missouri, as shown in the RECORD of this House, at page 9421, November 11, 1943, had this to say, after describing a certain young man by the name of Troy Lucas, who had been brought to him by a lady in Washington:

Who is this young man about whom I speak? Did he come from Missouri, or from my congressional district? No. It is an important coincidence, however, that this young man came from Kentucky, from the town of Southdown, which is located in the congressional district of the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House. To Troy Lucas, and millions of his buddies, I say the Military Affairs Committee of this House, under the Democratic leadership is too busy to give consideration to the human affairs of the men who are fighting to keep America free.

Then he heads his next paragraph with the word shame.

The political record of the President of the United States in regard to veterans is a shame in the eyes of the Nation.

Now let me cease to read and pause to state although I have already alluded to it, that the first vote I ever cast in the Congress of the United States was for a resolution to close the banks in March 1933. The second vote that I cast was a vote against what was known as the Economy Act to take care of the veterans of all of our wars. From that date to this, although I was pilloried in the public press as a traitor to the administration, I have been followed and supported loyally by the veteran organizations in my district, almost to a man, and they would do it again, if I asked them to. They know my voting record on veterans' legislation, they know all our voting records including the record of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]. The gentleman from Missouri then continues his charges and says, and I quote:

The political record of the majority Members of the House to give aid, to provide sustenance for the men and women who are returning from the bloody war is a shame. The procrastination of the Democratic leaders on the Military Affairs Committee of the House is a shame, and now comes a man

with one leg, all he has left from the battle of Tunisia, to place the blame on the very doorstep of not only the administration, not only the Democratic leadership, but on the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives.

I wonder if the House would be interested in knowing the real truth about that. Here it is. This young man that came to see the gentleman from Missouri had previously been to see the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, and while the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] was making that speech on Armistice Day and shaming the administration and Congress and the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, Troy Lucas was in Washington with all of his compensation and allowance paid up to date, and with a check for \$95 per month permanent disability for a lost leg, that had been granted and paid by the Veterans' Administration on November 9, 2 days before the speech was made.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes, I shall yield.

Mr. PLOESER. I trust that the gentleman has read my speech in its entirety.

Mr. MAY. Several times.

Mr. PLOESER. If he has, he will note that the speech contains the information that the Troy Lucas case had been adjudicated and it had been done by the influence of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. JOHN McCORMACK], to whom I sent Troy Lucas. It is so stated in the speech and so stated by me on November 11, and the date he received his compensation was November 9. I knew it at the time I was making the talk and it is contained in the speech. Furthermore, will the gentleman refer to page 9421 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—

Mr. MAY. I am not yielding for a speech now.

Mr. PLOESER. No; but this is simply for a correction, where he refers to me stating that the depression of 1933 was a Roosevelt depression. I did accuse the depression of 1937, which the gentleman probably would prefer to call a recession, as a Roosevelt depression.

The RECORD so states and the gentleman can well read it.

Mr. MAY. Yes; and the gentleman from Missouri received a letter on December 6 from Gen. Frank T. Hines in which he pointed out to him the fact that Troy Lucas had been paid on November 9, before he made his speech.

Mr. PLOESER. And General Hines—

Mr. MAY. I am not yielding further.

Mr. PLOESER. Will not the gentleman yield for the purpose of correction?

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman observe the House rules and sit down, please?

Mr. PLOESER. I will, gladly. Thank you.

Mr. MAY. On December 6 this fact was called to the gentleman's attention by Gen. Frank T. Hines in a letter which he addressed to "The Honorable WALTER C. PLOESER, House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C., My dear Mr. PLOESER," and so forth, and until this day, December 15—9 days—he has never sought an opportunity to make any corrections of the statements that he made on the floor of the House charging me with disloyalty to this veteran, when as a matter of fact, long before the veteran came to see Mr. McCORMACK he had come to my office, because he knew me in the days when he was at home and before he went into the military service, and I knew him, and I had directed him to the Veterans' Administration; but I am not going to take up more of my time with that except to say that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] has seen fit to furnish a copy of his speech to the Journal and American of New York City which carried it at length and it was sent to me by a friend with markings of the castigation that he had given me. Mr. Speaker, at this point I offer General Hines' letter for the RECORD as part of my remarks. It is as follows:

DECEMBER 6, 1943.

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PLOESER: My attention has been called to the debate which occurred on the floor of the House on November 11, 1943, reported on page 9420 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with reference to the adjudication of claims of disabled veterans of World War No. 2 and a specific claim, apparently that of Mr. Troy Lucas, C-3376511, was cited.

It was stated that this veteran was presented to the Veterans' Bureau and that "he was told that his case would be adjudicated as rapidly as possible, which means that he will receive his disability pension in the future—maybe 60 days from now, maybe 120 days." It was also asserted that "we have done nothing but to tell him to get out of uniform in 90 days and that within the next 2 to 4 months he will start getting his disability compensation." Inasmuch as Mr. Lucas' claim had been adjudicated and he had actually been paid the initial pension check on November 9, 1943, preceding the debate and remarks on November 11, 1943, I am sure you would wish the pertinent facts brought to your attention. Mr. Lucas was discharged from the active service at the Walter Reed General Hospital on October 4, 1943, and filed his application for pension at that time. The medical records were assembled by the military authorities and transmitted to the Veterans' Administration on October 29, 1943. The claim was rated on that date and service connection granted. Disability was evaluated as 60 percent in degree, and the award, including the special monthly pension of \$35 for the loss of one foot, was approved in the amount of \$95 per month. Mr. Lucas was informed of the decision immediately and the award certified to the disbursing office on November 5, 1943. Initial payment was made on November 9, 1943.

In this general connection it is desired to bring to your attention procedure agreed to by the War and Navy Departments and the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of expediting the adjudication of claims filed by men discharged because of disability. At the time of discharge the veteran is informed of his right to file a claim for pension and is assisted in making application in the event he desires to avail himself of this right. Certain specified records essential to the adjudication of a claim for pension are assembled and, with the application, transmitted to the Veterans' Administration where the claim is adjudicated at the earliest practicable date.

It is believed you will agree that where the necessary records and properly completed ap-

plication are forwarded promptly at the time of discharge for disability there will be no material lapse of time before the claim is granted or denied in the vast majority of instances. It sometimes happens that upon receipt of the records from the discharging center they are found to be insufficient upon which to take action upon the claim, necessitating further inquiry of the service branch. In these circumstances the decision in the case necessarily is deferred pending the result of further inquiry or development. With these exceptions, however, the Veterans' Administration has every reason to conclude that claims of veterans discharged for disability are promptly decided.

In closing, permit me to assure you that your interest in this subject is appreciated and that every possible effort will be made by the Veterans' Administration to see that all such claims are handled as promptly as circumstances will permit.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Just to have the record complete, I think it is only fair to the gentleman from Kentucky, the gentleman from Missouri, and, in justice to myself, that the young man, Mr. Lucas—and he is a very fine young man I think we all agree—

Mr. MAY. We have plenty of them down there.

Mr. McCORMACK. Both the people who came to see me told me they had been to see the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] prior to coming to my office and that he was cooperating in every way he could. I was glad to contact the Veterans' Administration because I would do it for any veteran no matter from what part of the United States he came, and I am sure any one of us would be only too glad to do that, particularly the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. And the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], always a friend to the needy, did all he could for my constituent, for which I am deeply grateful.

Mr. Speaker, I desire for a few moments to repudiate the charges that have been made against my committee. The House unanimously, of course, approved the selective-service legislation which came from the House Military Affairs Committee. We reported the original bill in 1940. Due to the foresight not of the chairman of the committee but of every member of the committee with the aid of the administration, the War Department, the Navy Department, and of the service organizations we were wise enough to write into that legislation a provision, section 8 of the original act, anticipating this very kind of case, a provision directing that the Selective Service Bureau should set up an organization in that Bureau to aid veterans as they were discharged, aid them in securing their compensation, their pension, and any other allowances that were due them. In compliance with that provision of law an organization has been set up and General Hershey, the Director of the Selective Service System, has obtained lists of all the men as they are discharged and of every man in hospi-

tals before they are discharged. He has addressed a letter in this form to each one of them:

To each soldier and sailor about to return to civil life:

For your benefit the Government is glad to give you the following information: Section 8 of the Selective Service Act of 1940 provides that the Government will render aid in the replacement in their former positions or in securing positions for men who have satisfactorily completed their military or naval services. The carrying-out of these provisions of the act is made a part of the responsibility of the Director of the Selective Service System and the Replacement Division in the Selective Service System has been set up to make this part of the act effective.

Then he states a number of things and points out the organization to which they can go and to which they are directed to go. First, there is the American Red Cross, so that if a man is discharged somewhere from a camp and there is no local board near he can go direct to the American Red Cross, to the Federal Security Agency, to the Veterans' Administration, to the United States Employment Service; and then he adds:

Your agents, for information and help, are: One, the Red Cross, and while in the hospital maintain contact with their representative or their camp representative if you are returned to your unit for discharge. (b) The local employment committeeman.

Now, this is something probably all of you have not had occasion to look into:

Upon your discharge and arrival at the place to which you go you should establish connection with the reemployment committee attached to the nearest local board and with the local Red Cross chapter. Keep your contacts with them and let them know where you go.

That is signed: "Lewis B. Hershey."

In addition to that there is a long list of civilian agencies not created by Congress. He has issued a circular directed to all the State directors throughout the country in which he directs them to direct the veterans to these different organizations, and here they are:

Local boards, reemployment committeemen, cooperating agencies, and in addition to that as follows: The Veterans' Administration, United States Employment Service, Veterans' Employment Service, Vocational, Rehabilitation and Training Division of the Federal Security Agency, Red Cross, Civil Service Commission, the Armed Emergency Relief, United States Armed Forces Institution, Madison, Wis. It seems that State set up one of its own.

Then there are even a lot of clearing-house committees. Here is where they come from: "The National Clearing-house Committee." The National Clearinghouse Committee consists of representatives from each of the following organizations: American Farm Bureau Federation, American Federation of Labor, American Iron and Steel Institute, American Legion, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Disabled American Veterans, Kiwanis International, Lions International, National Association of Manufacturers, National Exchange Clubs, National Grange, Railway Labor Executives Association, Rotary International, United States Chamber of Commerce, United

States Junior Chamber of Commerce, and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

All of those civilian groups and organizations are participating in the efforts brought about by the Selective Service Bureau to aid the veterans as they come out of the hospitals.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. ROLPH. I am wondering when the Military Affairs Committee under the gentleman's chairmanship will report out the bill that carries an immediate pay for these men who are being mustered out of the service?

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman mean muster-out pay?

Mr. ROLPH. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I shall answer the gentleman very gladly by saying to him that within 2 or 3 days after the bill was referred to the House Military Affairs Committee I proceeded to go into action to do something about it. I notified all of the agencies concerned and asked them for reports of their favor or opposition to it.

I then called the committee together and started hearings. We conducted hearings all last week, and at the end of the hearings I set aside a day for Members of Congress to be heard and we heard all who came, including the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]. In addition to that, we find that most of the difficulty and the misinformation that is going out to the country which brings pressure upon the House of Representatives and the Senate goes out because of the fact that there are some hardship cases in the country where neglect perhaps has been found to exist, where hardship has been incurred by some of these disabled veterans.

Mr. ROLPH. Does not the gentleman think it should be brought out on the floor and that all those things should be cleared up?

Mr. MAY. We were going to bring it out yesterday when I and behold the veterans' organizations on the outside that spend their time in peacetimes as well, as in wartimes looking after the interest of the veterans of all our wars, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, and American Legion, asked for further consideration. We even met yesterday in a subcommittee to hear them. One of the representatives came before us and said they did not think we ought to consider simply muster-out pay but that we ought to take up at this time and consider the whole problem of muster-out pay and adjusted compensation, the latter of which will amount to some fifteen or sixteen billion dollars. We thought that was a rather large order just now.

Mr. ROLPH. Does not the gentleman think it would be advisable to consider muster-out pay to take care of these men that are being discharged at the present time?

Mr. MAY. There are many considerations that enter into that picture. The Senate has already reported for consideration, or, at least, the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate has reported for consideration what is actually an ad-

justed-compensation bill. We felt if we passed out some bill now and it was passed hurriedly, it might go to the Senate and be treated perhaps as unnecessary, that the Senate might pass a different bill, send it over here, it would come here and we might deal with it.

In view of all of the major problems involved we ought to give it more consideration and bring out a real bill perhaps, that will serve the whole purpose if that can be done, especially in view of the fact that out of 635,000 men already discharged—I believe 900,000 all told—there is hardly a man of them who has not a good job already. There are jobs hanging on the bushes for every man who comes out who is able-bodied and the Veterans' Administration is standing by with its billions to take care of those who are disabled. Congress has already done everything within its power to provide for the sick, disabled, and wounded.

Mr. ROLPH. I am receiving many, many communications from my district urging that this legislation be considered at once.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman is not the only Member of the House who is receiving them. I get them myself.

Mr. BUSBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I prefer not to, because I have very little time left.

Mr. BUSBEY. I want to make a correction. The gentleman referred to the fact that there are jobs waiting for all the able-bodied men being discharged. It is my impression these men who are being discharged are not able-bodied but are physically handicapped men.

Mr. MAY. Well, the gentleman is not properly advised if that is his understanding, because there are thousands upon thousands of men who have been discharged at their own request to take jobs and the War Department has been for 2 years discharging men who are able-bodied unquestionably because some employer has a job available to them. Some of those men are now in jobs paying \$300 to \$500 a month and a lot of people would want us to give these men \$300 just the same as men who had served on the bloody battlefields overseas for 1, 2, or 3 years.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. As a matter of fact, a great many men were discharged when the age limit was changed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed for another 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. A great many were discharged when the older men in service were permitted to return to civil life?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. In practically all of those cases they were not physically disabled?

Mr. MAY. Yes; and the pending legislation would pay them the maximum amount that it would pay a man who is still fighting in Europe and when he is discharged he would be discharged at a time when he will not have available a job like the ones they are getting at the present time. The gentleman from Ohio is entirely correct.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman's statement left some uncertainty, I believe, as to the status of the action taken by the Senate. As I understand, the Senate actually passed by an overwhelming vote a bill providing for mustering-out pay, and that bill was referred to the gentleman's committee, was it not?

Mr. MAY. No, it has only been reported out of the subcommittee to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. It has not even gotten out of the full committee yet.

Mr. KEEFE. The Senate has not passed it?

Mr. MAY. No, they have just reported it to the Senate.

Mr. KEEFE. It was simply passed by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. So there has been no actual action taken by the Senate to provide for mustering-out pay?

Mr. MAY. No; and there likely will not be until after the holidays.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTELLO. Is it not true that the mustering-out pay is not intended in any way to take care of hospital cases or disabled veterans, that the Congress has already provided legislation whereby disabled veterans are entitled to hospitalization and other forms of relief, and that the mustering-out pay is not intended for that purpose? The sole purpose of mustering-out pay is simply to provide a fund whereby a soldier, as he is released from military service, can take care of the transition to civilian life, and nothing more than that. I think that is being confused a great deal in the press by coupling together mustering-out pay and hospitalization, disability benefits, and things of that kind, for in one sentence the papers are referring to those different benefits and confusing them and charging the Congress generally with laxity in not taking care of the problem, when, as the gentleman has pointed out, the Congress has taken care of everything except the matter of the mustering-out pay itself, which is only a minor problem by comparison with the others.

Mr. MAY. I should like to add to the statement very correctly made by my colleague from California that not only is that true but we have chastized the heads of every organization concerned, including General Hines, the Army, the

Navy, and everybody else concerned, every time we have had them before our committee on the question of taking care of the sick, the disabled, and the wounded. They have all expressed the deepest interest in immediate aid to all our sick and wounded soldiers, and are doing all they can.

I shall yield now to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], who has been particularly active in that respect.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In line with the discussion of the gentleman from California and the distinguished chairman of my committee, I wonder if the gentlemen would tell the House of the action taken by our committee after we learned of those distressing cases of the disabled, whose claims for disability compensation and pension could not be immediately processed and who were forced to wait several months to get relief. I wish the gentleman would explain specifically what we have done to eliminate administrative difficulties and expedite final adjudication of these claims.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman from Indiana has propounded a question on a very interesting subject. As I just stated, we have done everything we could possibly do. We have discussed the question of whether or not additional legislation would facilitate the adjustment and settlement of the claims of these wounded and disabled soldiers. We have been told by all of the agencies that they did not need any further legislation.

One of the reasons given by Gen. Frank T. Hines, who, by the way, is one of the greatest Administrators in the Government and has one of the greatest jobs on his hands, was that he is short 4,000 men that he needs in order to facilitate this work.

In addition, we were instrumental in procuring from the Chief of Staff of the United States Army action on the matter by which he authorized the Veterans' Administration to set up in every Army hospital in this country, in the field, and in Walter Reed Hospital, facilities by which they could speed up the handling of these cases, get a list of the men as fast as they came in the hospitals, with the probable length of time they would be there, and inform the Selective Service Bureau, the Veterans' Administration, the local draft boards, the Red Cross, and all of the other agencies engaged in granting relief.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Is it not true that the Army, the Navy, and the Veterans' Administration have now agreed that men will not be discharged for physical disability incurred in line of duty until after their claims have been processed and adjudicated? Therefore, these disabled veterans will continue to draw their service pay and be hospitalized until their compensation or pensions have been authorized.

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Have we not been working to accomplish that objective so that these boys who are returned to civilian life after having suf-

fered wounds or disabilities in the service will not have to wait longer than their first month to get their checks?

Mr. MAY. That is correct, notwithstanding the inexcusable attack of the youthful gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The unfortunate thing about it all is that up until now disabled men have been separated from the service by discharge and have been forced to wait 2 or 3 months, sometimes 6 months, to get their disability compensation, in the meantime having no means of support and not being able to work. That is not the fault of Congress, because we have enacted adequate legislation. It is purely an administrative problem. We now think we have that solved. Am I right about that?

Mr. MAY. Not only is the gentleman right about that, but, if I should ask him a question and require him to answer whether or not the House Committee on Military Affairs is chiefly responsible for that improved condition, the gentleman would have to say yes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Undoubtedly. We have been working on it ever since these cases have been called to our attention. Nobody in this House or in any other Government position has been more interested in trying to get the problem solved so that the administrative difficulties could be overcome than have the members of this committee. Every member of the Committee on Military Affairs has worked hard and diligent on this and many other matters vital to the prosecution of the war. There has been no politics in this committee and I commend my distinguished chairman for his patriotic hard work in this committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from Kentucky that I agree with everything he has said. The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation brought out and passed some time ago legislation putting the burden of proof on the Government, when these men were discharged, to show that their disabilities existed prior to their enlistment, and that their service had not aggravated those disabilities. That brought a great deal of relief from the condition to which the gentleman from Kentucky refers.

May I say further that it comes with rather poor grace for a Member of Congress to get on the floor of the House and criticize the committees that are doing their best for these veterans, and talking about veterans from some other district. If they are from the district of the Member, it is the duty of that Member to take those claims up and have them expedited, and he can do it if he will. If they are from other districts, the matter should be called to the attention of the Member from whose district the cases come. There should not be an attempt to leave the impression with the country that the Congress of the United

States is not doing everything it can to take care of the disabled veterans of this war.

Mr. MAY. That kind of thing, if the gentleman from Mississippi will permit, is almost equivalent to a stab in the back, because everybody in the community where Troy Lucas came from knows Jack May. Everybody in the community knows Troy Lucas, and if that was circulated in a New York paper into my district it would unquestionably raise the question of, "Has our Representative been faithful to his constituents?"

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. No; I will not yield any more. That is the reason why I say "there is so much good in the worst of us and so much bad in the best of us" that we ought to be careful what we say about each other, because we are all human beings.

I will ask, Mr. Speaker, in addition to what I have already said, unanimous consent here to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks this letter and instructions from the Selective Service System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., September 29, 1943.
To State Directors, Local Boards, Reemployment Committee Men:
Subject: Reemployment Procedure, Revised.

From inquiries received from a number of State headquarters, some of which have forwarded questions from Reemployment Committee men, it seems advisable to issue a new bulletin on the work of the Reemployment Division.

A new procedure covering discharges from the Army will go into effect about the first of January, which is expected to be followed shortly by adoption of a somewhat similar procedure by the Navy and Marine Corps. Accordingly, a new Reemployment Bulletin No. 1 has been prepared covering the work of the Reemployment Division under the new procedure. Sufficient copies are being forwarded to you to furnish one for each local board in your State and one for each Reemployment Committee man and a reserve stock for future uses.

In addition to the new procedure covered in the Reemployment Bulletin No. 1, the War Department has under consideration, and has given tentative approval to, a policy under which it will in the future refuse to furnish medical records of veterans to prospective employers, even though accompanied by a waiver from the veteran. Since the military exit examinations are far more thorough than those given by any employer, access by employers to these records is tantamount to saying that the veteran must pass a far more thorough physical examination than the nonveteran. The cases in which employers are demanding Army or Navy medical records of veterans should be reported to this headquarters.

It would be appreciated if you would forward this bulletin to each newly appointed Reemployment Committee man at the time of his appointment.

For the Director:

LEWIS SANDERS,
Colonel, Field Artillery,
Chief, Reemployment Division.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C.

REEMPLOYMENT BULLETIN No. 1, ISSUED
SEPTEMBER 29, 1943

REEMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

I. Reemployment organization

1. Statutory Authority

Paragraph (g) of section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, directs that a Personnel Division¹ be established to protect the reemployment rights of veterans, and pursuant to that mandate, the Director of Selective Service established the Reemployment Division. This Division is charged with the responsibility of replacing in former positions, or aiding in securing new positions for, those persons satisfactorily completing service in the armed forces. In fulfilling its functions, the Reemployment Division is authorized to utilize the services of any or all departments and any or all officers or agents of the United States, and to accept the services of all officers and agents of the State and Territories. Reemployment rights apply to all honorably discharged veterans, male and female, whether inducted, enlisted, or commissioned, subsequent to May 1, 1940.

2. War Shipping Administration Included

At the request of the War Shipping Administration, the Reemployment Division of Selective Service will handle all the reemployment benefits accorded men discharged from the merchant marine pursuant to Public Law 87 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

3. Reemployment Program Decentralized

The Reemployment Division has been and is operating under a decentralized plan, in which operations are at the local level, supervision is at the State level, and planning and interpretations of the act are at the national level. At the local level Reemployment Committee men attached to each local board serve as the agents and counselors of the veterans with direct responsibility to restore them to their old jobs and serve as liaison agents and contact men with the other Government agencies which provide specific services for the veterans. Clearinghouse committees are being formed in each community to make available the organized resources of the community in reintegrating veterans into civilian life.

4. National Headquarters

National headquarters of the Selective Service System prepares the general plans and makes all decisions in interpreting the application of the act. This is necessary in order to secure uniformity of interpretation, since many organizations affected are interstate and a lack of uniformity in the application of the act would make it unworkable. National headquarters maintains liaison with all the national bodies interested in employment. National headquarters under the new separation procedure, when in effect, will furnish the State headquarters with classified tallies of its Reemployment Committee men's reports.

5. State Headquarters

State headquarters of the Selective Service System selects and recommends the appointment of the Reemployment Committee men, inspects their activities, sees that those not functioning are replaced, and arranges for the appointment of additional Committee men in any locality where the reemployment load necessitates it, the object being to have sufficient Committee men in each locality so that

every veteran receives immediate and personal attention to his needs. It transmits the Reemployment Committee men's reports to national headquarters. The State clearinghouse committee, when formed, will maintain liaison with the State director in handling State-wide problems. The service of one officer, in whole or in part, and one full-time secretary should be adequate to handle the reemployment problems at the State level.

6. Local Boards

Local boards are the mailing addresses of the Reemployment Committee men attached to them, and local boards should refer only honorably discharged veterans who report to them to their Reemployment Committee men. The Reemployment Committee men should turn over to the local boards their records after final disposition of the cases. In case a Reemployment Committee man resigns, all his records should be turned over to the local board for transfer to his successor. Reemployment Committee men are entitled to local board stationery and have the franked mailing privileges of the Selective Service System.

7. Reemployment Committee Men

The Reemployment Committee men attached to each local board are the veterans' personal representatives, agents, and advisers. They have direct responsibility to return veterans to old jobs, see that they are properly serviced by the Government agencies set up to help them, and report to their State headquarters the disposition of all such cases. They should be informed of the veterans' reemployment rights as specified in section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. They should report all reemployment cases with controversies that they cannot adjust to the clearinghouse committees, when formed, in their respective communities; maintain close liaison with them, and, until these committees are formed, report all such cases to their State headquarters as at present. They should refer all new placement cases to the veterans' employment representatives of the United States Employment Service and follow up each case until satisfactory placement is accomplished. They should, through their community contacts, especially through the clearinghouse committee, make the organized resources of the communities available in replacing the veterans in civil life, particularly in creating preferential employment opportunities for veterans and occupational opportunities for the disabled.

(c) State clearinghouse committees: State clearinghouse committees, now being formed, will consist initially of representatives from the organizations of the national committee. After the State clearinghouse committees are formed they will establish liaison with State headquarters of selective service and will organize the local clearinghouse committees, which in turn will establish liaison with all Government agencies at the local level.

(d) Local clearinghouse committees: Local clearinghouse committees are to be organized in all the cities and towns of the Nation. These will consist of representatives of the national clearinghouse committee organizations and such other groups as are available and in position to render assistance in the local communities.

(e) Function of clearinghouse committees: The function of the clearinghouse committees will be to handle, as community problems, all reemployment cases that cannot be adjusted by the Reemployment Committee men and to make available the combined resources of the community in supporting the efforts of the Reemployment Committee men and the United States Employment Service.

II. Reemployment rights and benefits of the discharged men

1. Application May Be Made at Any Local Board

The discharged man may, at his own option, have his employment problems handled by a Reemployment Committee man attached to the local board at which he is registered (if he is a registrant) or by a Reemployment Committee man attached to any other local board, if reference to the local board at which he is registered would be inconvenient.

8. Cooperating Agencies

Reemployment Committee men must maintain personal contact with the local representatives of the several governmental agencies which are established to serve the returning veterans and be familiar with their functions. These agencies and their functions are as follows:

(a) The Veterans' Administration: This agency adjudicates pension claims of all honorably discharged persons who served in the active military or naval service after December 7, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war. It provides, in service-connected cases, hospitalization, if necessary, and domiciliary care, disability pensions, and vocational rehabilitation of all types, such as shop, commerce, university, etc., and cooperates in eventual placement with the United States Employment Service.

(b) The United States Employment Service: This agency operates under the War Manpower Commission and carries out the policies of the Commission in channelling employment to essential occupations and handles the releases of those transferring from one occupation to another, with the exception of honorably discharged veterans who have the right to reemployment in their old jobs.

(c) The Veterans' Employment Service: This agency has a State employment representative appointed to supervise the Veterans' Employment representatives attached to each local office of the United States Employment Service, through which the actual placements are made. They are responsible for the employment interests of all veterans registered with the United States Employment Service, except those veterans who desire reemployment in their old jobs.

(d) The Vocational Rehabilitation and Training Division of the Federal Security Agency: This agency, in connection with the State department of education in each State, operates vocational training in non-service-connected cases. It will assist in the training and education of those men who must learn a new trade or profession before returning to a civilian occupation and who do not come under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration.

(e) Red Cross: The home service of the American Red Cross in every community will assist veterans and their families in solving their personal problems. It is familiar with processing the necessary papers involved with the Veterans' Administration, if this has not been done at the discharging point.

(f) Civil Service Commission: The reemployment committeemen should inform any veteran who is seeking a Federal Civil Service position that he may obtain information regarding such positions at any post office or Civil Service office.

(g) Army Emergency Relief: This agency will extend temporary financial relief to soldiers and their dependents, including veterans discharged since September 16, 1940, in cases that cannot be taken care of by the Red Cross. They can be contacted through each service command.

(h) United States Armed Forces Institute, Madison, Wis.: This agency will undertake

¹ Called "Personnel Division" in the act; name changed to "Reemployment Division" to avoid confusion with the personnel division existing in all Government departments, including the Selective Service System itself.

to provide records of courses taken by military personnel while in service, for submission to civilian educational institutions, employers, and other properly interested agencies, and will, on application, give to military personnel and those recently discharged special examinations which will serve as a basis for the granting of academic credit by civilian schools and colleges.

9. Clearinghouse Committees

(a) Formation and organization: The National Clearinghouse Committee has been formed and is now organizing State and local clearinghouse committees. Fifteen national organizations constitute the National Clearinghouse Committee. In most instances, State clearinghouse committees will contain most of the organizations represented on the national committee. The clearinghouse committees are autonomous, and no Government official is eligible for membership, except in ex officio liaison capacity as may be desired under certain local conditions.

(b) National Clearinghouse Committee: The National Clearinghouse Committee consists of representatives from each of the following organizations:

American Farm Bureau Federation.
American Federation of Labor.
American Iron and Steel Institute.
American Legion.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Disabled American Veterans.
Kiwanis International.
Lions International.
National Association of Manufacturers.
National Exchange Club.
National Grange.
Railway Labor Executive Association—(invited—acceptance pending).
Rotary International.
United States Chamber of Commerce.
United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.
Veterans of Foreign Wars.

2. Assistance of Reemployment Committee Men

The veteran with an honorable discharge has the right to the services of his Reemployment Committee man in securing reinstatement in his old job or in assistance in securing a new job through placing him in liaison with the Veterans' Employment Service and United States Employment Service, and for assistance with the Veterans' Administration.

3. Veterans' Administration Vocational Rehabilitation

Those persons who served in the active military or naval service on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war and are honorably discharged therefrom, have the right to file an application with the Veterans' Administration and are entitled to the following benefits, provided the requirements of the law and regulations issued thereunder are met: (1) Hospitalization and domiciliary care. (2) Disability pension. (3) Vocational rehabilitation. The Reemployment Committee men will place such veterans in contact with the Veterans' Administration. The home service of the American Red Cross is familiar with processing the necessary papers involved.

III. New procedure and report of separation WD AGO form 53

(This new form should be in the field by January 1, 1944, and should eliminate duplication of efforts now occurring.)

1. WD AGO Form 53

The Adjutant General, working in conjunction with Selective Service, has developed and adopted a new report of separation officially identified as WD AGO Form 53. The

² In service-connected cases only.

servicing of seven forms and five letters has been eliminated and consolidated into the writing of this one simplified form by the discharging authority, six (6) copies being required, which will be a part of the Army's basic discharge procedure.

2. Disposition of WD AGO Form 53

(a) Insurance notice: To Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C. (To be accompanied by Soldier's Qualification Card WD AGO Form 20, when pension claim is made.)

(b) Posting copy: To The Adjutant General's Office, Washington, D. C. (Then to be transmitted to National Headquarters, Selective Service System.)

(c) Board of registration copy: To State director of Selective Service for the State of registration; to be transmitted to the local board of registration.

(d) Reemployment Committee man copy: To the proper State Director of Selective Service for transmittal to the Reemployment Committee man at the address of employment. (To be accompanied by Soldier's Qualification Card WD AGO 20, when no pension claim is made.)

(e) Veterans' employment representative copy: To the State veterans' employment representative of the War Manpower Commission through the State director of selective service for the State shown in item (d) above.

(f) Soldier's copy: Copy to be handed to the discharged soldier. This copy has the soldier's duties, rights, and benefits printed on the back, and will serve as a certificate to identify the soldier with his Reemployment Committee man, his veterans' employment representative (whether or not they have received their respective copies); also with the United States Civil Service Commission, and shows that he is entitled to a veteran's rights, such as registering as a veteran with the United States Employment Service.

3. Medical Information

Diagnosis is on copy for local board of registration. (This is confidential.) Statement of employment handicap is on the forms for the Reemployment Committee man and veterans' employment representative. This information is not on the veteran's copy.

IV. Disposition and use of Reemployment Committee man's copy of Report of Separation (WD AGO Form 53)

1. Reemployment Committee Man's Use of WD AGO Form 53

The Report of Separation, WD AGO Form 53, and Soldier's Qualification Card, WD AGO Form 20, should be retained by the Reemployment Committee man for future reference in the event the veteran concerned requires further assistance. The disposition of the case should be noted on the form, including referrals made, together with dates and other pertinent information. Every effort should be made by the Reemployment Committee man to make personal contact with the veteran for the purpose of determining whether assistance of any kind is required. Information will be forwarded later regarding special contact service that will be made available through the clearinghouse committee as they are formed. In cases where the veteran reports to a Reemployment Committee man before the Report of Separation on the man concerned is received, the Reemployment Committee man will accept the soldier's copy as evidence of the veteran's rights to consideration.

2. Reports by Reemployment Committee Man

The Reemployment Committee man will forward all reports on disposition of cases through State headquarters to national headquarters. These reports on disposition

of cases will be made as at present, pending the issuance of a new form to be used for this purpose. Reports should be made as soon as possible, and in no case should they be delayed beyond 30 days from receipt of Report of Separation.

3. Final Disposition of Records

In all closed cases, WD AGO Forms 53 and 20 should be deposited with the local boards to be held separately by them.

For the Director:

LEWIS SANDERS,
Colonel, Field Artillery,
Chief, Reemployment Division.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C.

To each soldier and sailor about to return to civil life:

For your benefit the Government is glad to give you the following information. Section 8 of the Selective Service Act of 1940, as amended, provides that the Government will render aid in the replacement in their former positions, or in securing positions for, men who have satisfactorily completed their military or naval service. The carrying out of these provisions of the act is made a part of the responsibility of the Director of Selective Service, and a Reemployment Division in the Selective Service System has been set up to make this part of the act effective.

Attached to each local board in the United States are one or more Reemployment Committee men who are to act as your personal representatives in your home community and aid you in reestablishing yourself upon discharge whether you entered the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard as a volunteer or selected man.

There are several Government agencies also involved in aiding you and the reemployment committeeman cooperates with them all and will act with them on your behalf when you report to him through your local board on your return to your home community. These agencies and their functions for your benefit are as follows:

1. The American Red Cross is the official medium of communication between the people of the United States and the Army and Navy. Field Directors at Army and Navy camps and hospitals, and chapters in each home community assist servicemen and veterans and their families in solving their personal and family problems; arrange temporary financial assistance when required; and help in filing and presenting claims for pensions and other Government benefits.

2. The Federal Security Agency, whose Rehabilitation and Vocational Training Division operated by the State department of education, provides for the employment adjustment of physically impaired persons.

3. The Veterans' Administration maintains hospitals for the care of men incapable of being rehabilitated to reenter civil life, and provides them with artificial limbs or other appliances, if needed, and handles their pension claims.

4. The United States Employment Service has special veteran placement representatives at all offices and maintains contact with employers and their specific needs.

Your agents then for information and help are:

(a) The Red Cross. While in the hospital, maintain contact with their representative or their camp representative if you are returned to your unit for discharge.

(b) The local Reemployment Committee man. Upon your discharge and arrival at the place to which you go, you should establish communication with the Reemployment Committee man attached to the nearest local board and with the local Red Cross chapter.

Keep your contacts with them and let them know where you are.

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished and able ranking member of my committee, who is always cooperative and helpful.

Mr. THOMASON. Referring again to the unfair and unjust criticism and aspersions made by our friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], I believe I voice the sentiment of the entire membership of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, both Democrats and Republicans, and I know that I voice my own sentiment, when I say that, although there have been times when I have violently disagreed with the chairman of the committee, yet I will say this for him, that I have never doubted, and so far as I know no man on the committee ever doubted his patriotism, his integrity, his industry, or his interest, not only in his own constituents, but in the welfare of the country. But the gentleman from Missouri went further and reflected upon the committee and every member of it, including his Republican colleagues. As I construe his statement, it not only covered the members of the majority side, but likewise the members of the minority side. So for the benefit of the RECORD I would like to make this statement, and I am sure no member of the minority side present—and I see several on the floor—will take issue with what I am about to say. If I do not truthfully state their feelings, I pause for correction. That is, that there has never been a time since we were threatened with war, and even before war was declared, when the Secretary of War, and especially the Chief of Staff, General Marshall, has ever called on your committee that they have not had prompt and favorable action from the Committee on Military Affairs, and that without regard to any politics or partisanship.

If I had the time—and I do not want to consume the time of the gentleman from Kentucky—I could mention a long list of bills from our committee that are now the law, beginning from the time when we amended the National Defense Act and took the ceiling off the size of the Army; when we authorized an adequate and efficient air force; when we said we would have selective service on a fair and democratic basis; and later when we said we would extend that for another year; and later when we said we would have a soldiers and sailors relief act; and still later when we said we would have an allowance and allotment act. Only recently we passed the so-called fathers draft bill, and now we are working every day to report a mustering-out bill.

I repeat, and if I am wrong I invite criticism from my friends who have already had something to say, like the distinguished and able Member from Indiana [Mr. HARNES] and my good friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], and others here on the floor, who belong to the same party as the gentleman from Missouri. Your committee day in and day out, with the exception of Sundays and holidays, either the whole committee

or some of its subcommittees, have been working in a supreme effort to win this war as quickly as possible and get our boys back home. The majority side and the minority side, all of us, are patriotic citizens, and many of us, including myself, with boys overseas, and I wonder if my young friend from Missouri does not think we also have a stake in this war. We want to win this war. I, too, want my son and son-in-law back in this country in peaceful pursuits as soon as possible. We want to back up General Marshall. I will say that I have seen the chairman, when I thought he was a little impulsive, but I never saw him run from a fight. I just want to say I have disagreed with him pretty strongly sometimes and some of my friends on this floor have also, but I never questioned his industry, or his integrity, or his patriotism, or his interest in the welfare of the soldiers of this country. There has certainly never been any straddling on his part, although sometimes he just about busted up the committee, but, nevertheless, on the final wind-up we got action and I see my good Republican friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] approving my remarks. I am sure I voice the sentiments of the whole committee when I say he has been right on the job every day for the welfare of the Nation and of the Army and of the soldiers, although sometimes, like all of us, he has made mistakes because he is human.

I would like to yield to my friend from Ohio, although the gentleman from Kentucky has the floor. I do not see the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], nor the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], nor the very able member on the Republican side, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], but I am sure they will confirm my statement and agree with me that there is no politics in our committee. Our business and duty is to provide necessary legislation for the winning of the war, and that we have done. Frankly, I think our colleague from Missouri was striking below the belt.

Mr. MAY. I am profoundly grateful to my colleague the gentleman from Texas for the fine tribute he pays not only to our fine Committee on Military Affairs, but to me as its chairman, and let me add that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] sits at my right hand on the committee as the majority ranking member, and if there ever was a real right-hand man in the whole wide world he surely fills the bill. He is patient, tolerant, forbearing, and always loyal and devoted to duty and to me as chairman. I can with utmost faith and confidence always turn to him for sound advice, and he is generous and very helpful.

Now, as a final word, let me suggest that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], if he has not read it, that Christ once rebuked an accuser with these words, "Let him who is without sin cast the first stone."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield briefly.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes prior to the statement of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], if it were agreeable to the gentleman and the others who had special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). There are 65 minutes of previous special orders now pending.

Mr. PLOESER. May I say for the benefit of the Chair, I would appreciate it, if the Chair would put the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is hardly fair to those who have special orders already granted.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes, prior to the statement of the gentleman from South Dakota.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Dakota has been recognized. If he cares to yield to the gentleman—

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], has had plenty of time to speak and has spoken repeatedly. I have 20 minutes following the gentleman from South Dakota, in which I want to speak on the Bill of Rights. Today is the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of that Bill of Rights.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield briefly.

Mr. PLOESER. Long enough for me to say that after I had asked unanimous consent for the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] to speak for an additional 15 minutes, the gentleman saw fit never to yield beyond that point. He yielded to others to try to build up a case, which is clear in the record.

These considerations have all come about since November 11, since the pressure has been put on to try to bring action. For 2 years there has been delay. The RECORD of December 6 gives you 14 more cases that you can ask General Hines to answer and also ask him why he did not read my address of November 11 in its entirety so that he would not have been obliged, and there would not be any necessity for him, to waste his time writing such a letter.

I thank the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Not at the moment. I want to talk about an altogether different subject and my time is limited.

HOW TO STOP A GWIBIT: JOIN THE A. A. F. E. G.

Mr. Speaker, I take the floor this afternoon to call to the attention of the country and the Congress the organization of a new association for the advancement of American ideals and interests. It will be known for short as the A. A. F. E. G., but after the true New

Deal manner, these initials are to designate the full name of the order which is the American Association for Eliminating Gwibits.

We have heard much in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, about the bungling of bureaucrats. Mail from our constituents is replete with complaints and criticisms about the inefficient and often arrogant manner in which New Deal bureaucrats order private citizens around, hamstringing their activities, and circumscribe what have always been considered their American rights and liberties.

I feel that today, which is Bill of Rights Day, it is especially appropriate that we discuss the matter I have in mind. The vast growth of big government in Washington—much of it taking place long before the war in Europe, to say nothing of the date of our entrance into it—has, to an unprecedented state, put the Government into business and pushed political appointees into the private offices and individual homes of this Republic. As a result, bureaucracy has reached a magnitude and become a menace in this country far beyond that of any previous era in our national history.

The land of the free and the home of the brave is still emphatically the home of the brave but, unless brave men devote themselves to the task of restoring Government to the people, it may not much longer be the home of the free.

Prominent among the forces which are fettering freedom in this country, Mr. Speaker, is the all-American "gwibit." Just as the termite destroys the foundations of Government buildings, so the "gwibit" destroys the fundamentals of Government institutions. Slowly but surely our strength is being sapped and our future impaired by a galaxy of "gwibits" whose resistance to progress is only excelled by their proclivities for procrastination.

Before defining a "gwibit" as the white-colored wanton which he is, however, permit me to emphasize that not all bureaucrats are "gwibits." There are both good and bad bureaucrats, Mr. Speaker. Many career public servants both in and out of the civil service are able and devoted officials and workers with a zest for their job and a zeal for their country. Such honest and helpful public servants are as essential to good government as taxes and statutes and they are entitled to general respect and generous recompense. The "gwibit" is, in fact, as distasteful and damaging to the good bureaucrat as he is to the patriotic private citizen.

ALL NEOCRATS ARE "GWIBITS"

One of the fundamental reasons why New Deal bureaucracy functions so badly and serves so poorly is the fact that under the present administration the trend has been away from old-line, experienced, faithful bureaucrats and toward a new type of political appointee sometimes described as a neocrat. Webster's dictionary defines a neocracy as government by new and inexperienced officials, or as "upstart rule." It is from

the ranks of the neocrats, therefore, that the "gwibits" are recruited and while not all "gwibits" are neocrats, it is almost correct to say that all neocrats are "gwibits." They seldom if ever, at least, are more distantly related to "gwibits" than the relationship of leader and follower or payer and payee. Thus, they are sort of second political cousins at best, and at worst—which is usually the status quo—they become as identical as Siamese twins.

There is room in the American Association for Eliminating Gwibits, however, to include essential Government employees and busy, useful bureaucrats, just as there is room to include all citizens, both public and private, who believe in government of, for, and by the people and who want to do something to make it work.

HOW CAN YOU TELL A "GWIBIT" WHEN YOU SEE ONE?

What then, Mr. Speaker, is a "gwibit"? How can you identify one? First of all, a "gwibit" is a bureaucrat who "nos" a good idea when he sees one. But there are other ways, too, in which you can identify a "gwibit."

WHAT IS A "GWIBIT"?

A "gwibit" is two parts cold water, fastened to the backbone of an angle worm by a lot of red tape.

He knows it cannot be done, and has the "no how" to see that nobody does it.

He knows at least one word in every language, but it always translates into "no."

He thinks that a monkey wrench is something to throw, a buck is something to pass, and that an Ethiopian is an integral part of every wood pile.

He believes that responsibility is just another name for smallpox and treats it accordingly.

A "gwibit" does not hibernate like a bear. He just gets on the Government pay roll and maintains low visibility all-year round.

Hand an idea to a "gwibit" and you would think he had picked up a time bomb. First he soaks it thoroughly for 48 hours to be sure it has stopped ticking. Then he gingerly tosses it out the window, hopping it will land in somebody's back yard.

Recently a couple of "gwibits" paraphrased an old song. The title is, "Praise the Lord, and Pass the Inhibitions."

Give a "gwibit" enough rope and he is sure to hogtie something.

The first American "gwibit" on record was in Massachusetts. He got the ordinance passed in 1680 making illegal that new fangled contraption, a bathtub.

The "gwibits" are really trying to win the war in their own way. They have made so many so-called gwibit contributions, such as court-martialing General Billy Mitchell for sinking a battleship with a plane.

HISTORICAL GWIBITIZING

Patrick Henry: "Give me liberty or give me death."

Gwibit: "Your request will be forwarded through appropriate channels and you will be notified of the decision

in due course. However, it is suggested you propose several other alternatives since the categories you mention may already be supplied."

General Warren: "Don't shoot until you see the whites of their eyes."

Gwibit: "No such command is in military parlance and is impossible. Interpretation must be made by ranking oculist."

Farragut: "Full speed ahead, damn the torpedoes."

Gwibit: "We must caution you never to use full speed especially in forward motion. As for damming the torpedoes, that is out of your jurisdiction, since it is the function of War Information."

Major Devereaux: "Send us more Japs."

Gwibit: "If you will fill out a request in triplicate and present it accompanied with documentary evidence proving that your supply has been entirely exhausted it will be given consideration providing it is initiated by the Immigration Authority, the Collector of Customs, and the Food and Drug Administration and signed."

P. S.: In case you still have not figured it out—Guild of Washington Incompetent Bureaucratic Idea Throatcutters.

Caution: A gwibitzer is not to be confused with a kibitzer; the latter merely stands on the side lines and watches while the former sits in the path of progress and trips those who would traverse it.

GUILD OF WASHINGTON INCOMPETENT BUREAUCRATIC IDEA THROATCUTTERS

Mr. Speaker, from the foregoing it should be apparent to all that the Guild of Washington Incompetent Bureaucratic Idea Throatcutters—which translated into abbreviated New Deal vernacular is shortened into "gwibit"—is a force against freedom and a brake against progress which must be eliminated if this Republic is to function as intended by its founding fathers. However, all congenial and constant "gwibits" are members of the guild to which, however, they pay only passive loyalty since being active in anything is considered anathema by all members of this futile fraternity.

The time has now come to be on with the job of "gwibit" eliminating. Any citizen in private or public life who takes the initiative in proposing that an individual, community, or State refrain from asking the Federal Government to do for him, it, or them, anything which can be done without the aid of the Federal Government is helping to eliminate "gwibits."

"Gwibits" grow when citizens delegate to the Federal Government responsibilities and tasks which might better be handled locally. In fact, "gwibits," like guinea pigs, grow and multiply without the necessity of outside encouragement. It is doubly unfortunate, therefore, that the liquid-eyed largess of the New Deal has provided "gwibits" with such unprecedented and unparalleled encouragement. However, by refraining from delegating to the Big Government in Washington powers, authorities, tasks, responsibilities, duties, privileges, jobs, assignments,

regulations, and rights which can better be handled elsewhere, private citizens can help prevent the growth of a scourge of New Deal "gwibits" which otherwise will devitalize free government in Washington like a flock of grasshoppers devouring a wheat field in Kansas.

"PENCIL PACKING PAPA"

From the financial point of view, however, the menace of the "gwibit" is not so much from the standpoint of the amount of the people's money which he secures as salary as it is the vast amounts of the people's money which he spends as agent for the Government. Thus, a Government "gwibit" is in reality one of the world's most costly luxuries. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that some day a songwriter will write a song entitled, "Pencil Packing Papa, Lay That Checkbook Down." I am sure its popularity would be tremendous, and if its efficacy is even fractional, it should outsell and outstrip the original song from which it would be paraphrased.

Slowly but surely, we Americans are learning the awful axiom that when we ask the New Deal Washington to do something for us, it winds up by doing something to us. And the "do-gooder" who pushes the prod and sets the hook ninety-nine times out of a hundred is a congenital "gwibit" whose main goal in life is to hang onto his job.

A "gwibit" never gets very far on his own power and tries never to become separated from the source of his pay check. He thrives on what he is given and manages to give perpetual life to assignments to which he is attached. He seldom attacks new lines of endeavor not delegated to him, as that requires an exhibition of initiative which in the ethics of a "gwibit" is tantamount to treason to his tribe. Therefore, while it is difficult to decrease the "gwibits" which we have, it is possible to prevent their increase by abstaining from following the inviting impulse to transfer to the Federal Government the correction of problems which we can locally solve. It follows that the best place to kill a "gwibit" is close to home, and the most effective way to stop him from gwibitizing is before he gets going.

Only citizens who will pledge themselves to take some action in some way to stop the bad American habit of asking Washington to do for them what they should do for themselves are eligible for membership in the American Association for Eliminating Gwibits. George Poin-dexter, of Stepney, Conn., is the president of the association; the gentleman from South Dakota now addressing you is the secretary. We have no treasurer because, unless we succeed in eliminating "gwibits," we shall soon all be without money anyhow, and if we get the job done, energetic Americans will once again become able to earn and save their own independence without benefit of Government hand-out or organizational fee.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. I would like to give you a few definitions that I have heard around Washington of a bureaucrat.

First. A person who takes a 10-page memo to say "No."

Second. The original "too little and too late" man.

Third. A lawmaker who is not elected and therefore is not responsible for his acts.

Fourth. A person who would rather plan to plan than plan.

I would like to ask the gentleman if those definitions of a bureaucrat would classify him as a "gwibit"?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. I would say they would almost make such bureaucrats charter members of the "gwibit" organization.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. WEICHEL], at the conclusion of the last special order, may have 3 minutes in which to address the House, with the right to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of one of the greatest events in the history of mankind, the adoption of the Bill of Rights, which is contained in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

At the risk of being tedious, I am going to take these amendments up and discuss them in detail, but, first, let me say that when the Constitution of the United States was written in 1787, Thomas Jefferson, the greatest political philosopher of that day, was in France as our Minister to that country. When he returned he called attention to the fact that the Constitution was incomplete, that, while it provided for a central government, it did not take care of the rights of human beings for which mankind had been struggling for more than 2,000 years. He made them agree that before the Constitution was adopted these 10 amendments should be approved and become a part of the Constitution of the United States.

As I said the other day, these first 10 amendments constitute the "ten commandments" of American freedom. While we are talking of freedom for the other peoples of the world, we unfortunately have a communistic element in this country that would destroy that sacred document and wipe out that freedom that has been gained as Jefferson said by so much suffering, so much blood, and so much toil, through years and years of struggle, revolution, and reformation. It is the ark of the covenant of freedom and today we find peo-

ple throughout this country who are flouting it and who would wipe it from existence. When they do, American liberty as you and I know it, will have disappeared.

Amendment No. 1 provides:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

There is where the separation of church and state comes in, that enables you and me and every other American to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. That could not be done in the Old World at that time, and in some of the countries of the Old World it cannot be done now. We have had a great many religious rows in this country since that amendment was adopted, but there is not an instance on record that I have ever found where anybody had the audacity to enter a place of worship and try to break it up.

Freedom of speech and the freedom of the press are being challenged today. When they are gone, free government will have taken its flight and liberty will have gone down to the dust and perished among its worshippers. Nothing is more sacred, or more important, to the American people than free speech and a free press.

The second amendment provides:

A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

It is useless for me to comment on the value that amendment has been to the American people and the value it may be in years to come, because when you disarm a people, the weakest tyrant on earth may dominate the most populous country.

The third amendment provides:

No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

The people of the Old World up to that time, with a few shining exceptions, never had the benefit of such protection. It has been followed in a great many instances, but not in all countries. It has been carried out to the letter so far as the United States of America is concerned.

Amendment No. 4:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

That is a freedom that had not existed in the Old World. When the Bastille fell one man had been in there 35 years. When told to go home, he said: "Home? What are you talking about?" He had been there so long without trial that he

had even forgotten where he lived, although he had been a prosperous and influential young man when he was cast into prison.

The fifth amendment provides:

No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself; nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

This is probably the cornerstone of American liberty. We lawyers know what it means when we say a man cannot be twice put into jeopardy for the same offense. When a man is tried in a court of law before a judge or jury and a verdict of not guilty is rendered, he can never be arrested again on that charge or be put in jeopardy again for that offense. That was not true, and is not true today, in many countries of the world.

Nor shall he be deprived of life, liberty, and property without due process of law.

In other words, you cannot go out and seize a man's property, deprive him of life or liberty, without due process of law; that is, without taking that legal procedure established in this country that guarantees him a fair and impartial trial.

Nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

Our State constitution in Mississippi has a beneficent addition to that language. It provides that private property shall not be taken or injured for public use without just compensation.

Today when we see the governments of the world broken down, with fascism, communism, shintoism, and every other "ism" disturbing the minds of the people of the world, we turn back to this Bill of Rights, this ark of the covenant, if you please, that has protected us throughout the years of its existence, throughout the life of this Republic.

I am speaking as a southern Democrat, I am speaking as a man who has always stood for the Democratic Party, and I do not propose to have any bunch of crackpots run me out of that party. But there are some things taking place in this country that violate that part of the Bill of Rights in a most dangerous, a most unnecessary, and a most inexcusable manner.

There has been set up, by Executive order, what they call the Fair Employment Practices Committee that is going throughout the country trying to force private enterprise to comply with regulations that cannot be enforced. Right today they are also trying to make the railroads and railroad brotherhoods of the South adopt a policy of Negro equality.

It is a hard matter to discuss this issue on the floor of the House without

discussing the racial issue. If I mention the word "Jew" I am excoriated by a certain element that the better element of Jews despise, who are advocating communism from one end of the country to the other. When I mention the Negro, although I am one of the best friends he ever had, an infinitely better friend of his than any flannel-mouthed Communist who has tried to use him to stir up racial trouble, I am accused of race prejudice. These Communists are using the Negro as a smoke screen. They are not only making it impossible for themselves to live in this country after this war is over but they are destroying the Negro's hope for happiness and prosperity among the best friends he ever had on the face of the earth, and that is the white people of the Southern States.

I know we of the South have been accused of being unkind to the Negro. I know that we have been misrepresented throughout the country on this subject, but as the grandson of a slave holder, I want to say that no people under the shining sun ever did more for one race than the white people of the South has done for the Negro. If you will let him alone, if these Communist elements will let him alone, he will be able to make a living in that country throughout all the years that are to come, and to live in peace and harmony with the white people around him.

But this Fair Employment Practices Committee and this War Labor Relations Board are today trying to force the white people—white women, if you please—working for the Western Electric Co. in Baltimore to use the same washrooms and the same toilet facilities as the Negroes do. They are doing the Negroes more harm than anything else has since the days of reconstruction. We have lived with them for 300 years.

Mr. Speaker, we never reduced the Negro to slavery. We elevated him from the position of savage to that of servant. Throughout uncounted centuries he roamed through the wilds of Africa, one of the richest countries in all the world, and never developed the art of agriculture to the extent of making his living out of the ground. For countless centuries he trod the soil of his native land, with diamonds beneath his feet, and never dreamed of the theory of values. He bowed beneath his master's whip at the building of the pyramids and watched succeeding civilizations rise and fall, and all he ever learned was to construct a rude shelter of bark and grass to protect him from the beating rays of a tropical sun. He saw the dawn of civilization and watched the pageant of the centuries pass without so much as manifesting a desire to participate in progress; until we brought him to this country, taught him the rudiments of civilization, and showed him the light of Christianity through the unfortunate instrumentality of slavery—unfortunate for the white man, but fortunate for the Negro. Because human slavery has been the greatest curse the South ever had, yet the

greatest blessing the Negro had ever known up to that time. We are all glad it is gone, never to return.

Since the War between the States throughout the South, the Negroes have been able to live and enjoy peace and protection which the Communists are destroying for him.

Now they are demanding that every private enterprise employ Negroes and promote them, whether it wants them or not. Who is behind all this? It is these communistic elements I am referring to. They are creating dissension that will destroy his chance for happiness and a livelihood in the years to come. Then where will he go? Are your northern cities prepared to take care of him?

There are only four possible solutions of the race question. One of them would be the extermination of one race or the other. That is not to be contemplated. Another one would be deportation, which is out of the question. Another one would be amalgamation, to send the country down to become a miserable mass of amalgamated, degenerate humanity. That is unthinkable. The only one left is segregation, the one that the South has followed successfully for more than 300 years. Yet this F. E. P. C. is trying, without authority of law, without any right whatever, to destroy that policy and destroy what we are trying to do.

They are destroying, as I said, the Negro's hope for future happiness, and in time of war, when every white home in the South has somebody in the service, when our boys are shedding their blood upon every battlefield for America and America's institutions, they issue these orders and stir up racial resentment, racial hatred, and race trouble throughout the South, and also in many of the Northern States. You had a taste of it in Harlem and in Detroit, Mich.

Mr. Speaker, this attempt to take over the election machinery of the States is another violation of the Constitution, as well as the Bill of Rights. We cannot carry freedom to the people of the rest of the world, if we permit these safeguards of our own liberty to be destroyed.

And what if it is destroyed? What will take its place? Let me read you the words of one of the great statesmen of a hundred years ago, Daniel Webster, who said:

Other misfortunes may be borne, or their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under new cultivation, they will grow green again, and ripen to future harvests.

It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt.

But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government?

Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty?

Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty

with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity?

No; if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Colosseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful and a melancholy immortality. Bitter tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty.

God protect America from enemies without; God save America from those elements that would destroy it from within.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Blair Moody, ace reporter of the Detroit News, in his regular column, the Lowdown on Washington, captioned, "How about Congress' alibis on inflation?" The article is unanswerable and therefore unchallengeable. I ask that it be included in toto, notwithstanding the fact that it may slightly exceed the maximum of two pages.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted leave of absence indefinitely, on the advice of the House physician.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FOOD SUBSIDIES

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the two schools of thought—one of which believes that the American consumer can be best protected by wholly a price approach, and the other, which believes that the American consumer is best protected by an ample food-production program—seem to be at odds as much as ever. The reasons these groups do not see more eye to eye are: First, the improper use of supposedly reliable Federal information from Federal bureaus and spokesmen; and, second, the cheap political tricks which are being used to inject the issue into future political campaigns. The only time we hear about inflation is when the low-income groups are involved or when the American farmer is in the picture.

As an example of the use of supposedly reliable information from a Federal bureau, I wish at this time to call your attention to the table in the RECORD of November 29, page 10068. It is as follows:

Net cash income above expenses of typical commercial family-operated farms

1935-39 TO 1942 AND 1943

Type of farm	Location	Dollars increased income, 1942 over average 1935-39	Farm net cash income		
			1935-39	1940	1942
1. Wheat farms.....	Winter wheat area.....	\$3,700	\$1,990	\$1,670	\$5,690
2. Wheat, grain sorghum, livestock.....	do.....	3,264	1,700	1,600	4,960
3. Cash grain.....	Corn Belt.....	3,204	1,800	2,100	5,000
4. Hog-beef breeding, fattening.....	do.....	2,626	1,300	1,280	3,930
5. Wheat, corn, livestock.....	Winter wheat area.....	2,548	1,400	1,260	3,550
6. Hog, dairy.....	Corn Belt.....	1,331	1,090	839	2,420
7. Dairy.....	Wisconsin.....	1,078	1,110	1,270	12,190
8. Dairy.....	New York.....	1,040	960	1,200	12,000
9. Flue-cured tobacco.....	Virginia.....	656	800	740	1,460
10. Texas black waxy prairie.....	Cotton area.....	400	500	500	900
11. Georgia 2-mule.....	do.....	248	300	330	648
12. Mississippi Delta 2-mule.....	do.....	306	300	246	610
13. Fire-cured tobacco.....	do.....	232	200	500	430

INFORMATION ON 1943 SO FAR AS AVAILABLE

1. Wheat farms.....	Winter wheat area.....	\$4,800	\$1,990	\$1,670	\$5,770
2. Wheat, grain sorghum, livestock.....	do.....	4,539	1,700	1,598	5,240
3. Wheat, corn, livestock.....	do.....	3,220	1,400	1,260	4,620

¹ Preliminary.
² 1943.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Nov. 5, 1943.

I wish to say at this time that this table may meet one's approval if it is properly explained, but the table is not properly explained by the Government bureau which issued it. It is wrong to lead the consumer groups to believe that the farmers are receiving the net incomes which are shown in this table unless it is carefully explained. This causes disunity. It harms the war-food program. When I saw this table, I noted what it said regarding the Wisconsin dairy farms and felt it must be wrong. It happens that I had a report of the Pure Milk Products Cooperative in my files, which is as follows:

Production and number of producers by months, 1942-43

	Total production, 1942-43	Number of producers	Milk producers, monthly average per patron	Daily average production per farm
1942				
September.....	72,823,036	11,532	6,315	210.5
October.....	73,684,982	11,601	6,352	204.9
November.....	70,023,837	11,577	6,049	201.6
December.....	79,178,962	11,517	6,875	221.8
1943				
January.....	86,195,472	11,477	7,510	242.3
February.....	84,498,089	11,394	7,416	264.9
March.....	100,948,872	11,450	8,816	284.4
April.....	105,132,186	11,481	9,157	305.2
May.....	119,967,316	11,569	10,370	334.5
June.....	123,122,700	11,632	10,583	352.8
July.....	103,747,729	11,724	8,849	285.5
August.....	86,017,194	11,760	7,311	235.8
Total.....	1,105,340,375	11,550	7,966	262.0

¹ Average.

As this milk averages nearly 4 percent butterfat this would make (262 x 4%) about 10 pounds of butterfat. The average price of butterfat in Wisconsin in 1942 was 58 cents per pound. The members of the Pure Milk Products Cooperative, however, received a price above the State average price. The economic life of the producer and the economic life

of the communities, for that matter, are very directly affected by the price of this 10 pounds of butterfat produced on these farms each day.

What justification is there for all this talk about the large farmers being the ones that oppose roll-back subsidies?

You should also note that this one co-op handled 1,000,000,000 of the 98-, 000,000,000 pounds of milk that found its way into the commercial dairy channels of the Nation this last year.

With this information in mind, I called the office of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and asked for Dr. Tolley, the chief of the B. A. E. I was referred to Mr. O. V. Wells, as Dr. Tolley was not in. Mr. Wells asked that I wait until Dr. Tolley returned to the city before making any comment upon this table, which I agreed to do and which I have done. On December 7, I received the following letter from Mr. Wells:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
Washington, D. C., December 6, 1943.
HON. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: Reference is made to our telephone conversation of last week concerning incomes of Wisconsin dairy farmers printed on page 10068 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 29, 1943.

The Wisconsin dairy farms are typical of those dairy farms in southern Wisconsin that have about 17 milk cows and produce milk for processing. They are farms with about 115 acres of which 85 acres are cropped, and are considered to be about 2-man farms in size, including an operator, family help, and some hired labor at harvest time. The dairy herd produces about 73 percent of the farm income of which 59 percent is from dairy products and 14 percent is from the sale of cattle and calves. A fuller discussion of the subject is contained in the Agricultural Situation for January 1942, a copy of which is enclosed.

The income figures contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are representative of an important segment of the dairy farms in Wisconsin but should not be interpreted as

reflecting conditions prevailing on all groups of dairy farms in the State. The enclosed table contains comparisons between the typical Wisconsin commercial dairy farms and averages computed from the 1940 census. The main difference in the two sets of data is in the number of cows and the gross income per farm. The typical commercial farms contained an average of about 17 milk cows as compared with an average of 15 for the farms reporting dairy cows in the important 18 dairy counties of Wisconsin and 13 for the farms reporting dairy cows in the State. The average number of cows per farm for all farms in the 18 dairy counties and all farms in the State is even less than this.

The 1939 gross income for the typical commercial dairy farms was \$2,115 compared with an average of \$1,603 for all dairy farms in the 18 dairy counties and an average of \$1,387 for all dairy farms in the State. According to the census definition, dairy farms were those that received 40 percent or more of their gross income from dairy products.

As indicated in the article in the Agricultural Situation, the main purpose of these studies is to determine for a modal group of farms of some defined type annual changes in gross and net income. As index numbers they probably also represent fairly well changes in other groups of dairy farms in the State. When the volume of income and the changes in income are expressed in dollars and cents they can be considered to be representative of the modal group of farms for which the computation was made. In this case they apply to the group of farms described which have an average of about 17 milk cows and furnish employment for the equivalent of two men throughout the year.

Very truly yours,

O. V. WELLS,
Chief Program Analyst.

I have not the time to prove or disprove the statement that the typical wheat farmer of America made a net profit of \$5,690 in 1942 and \$6,770 in 1943, or whether the typical wheat-corn-livestock farmer of the winter-wheat area had a net of \$3,950 in 1942 and \$4,620 in 1943. If the ordinary reader looks at this table and thinks that it is the average net profit obtained by these various groups, it at least makes good propaganda for the professional subsidy roll-backers. I shall be content to confine my remarks to the State of Wisconsin. I wish to call your particular attention to these statements in Mr. Wells' letter:

The Wisconsin dairy farms are typical of these dairy farms in southern Wisconsin. The income figures contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are representative of an important segment of the dairy farms of Wisconsin, but should not be interpreted as reflecting conditions prevailing on all groups of dairy farms in the State.

In other words, the tables are set up to represent the typical commercial family operated farms of Wisconsin, but the facts are that these so-called typical farms are in southern Wisconsin, in only 18 of the 71 counties of the State, where they had 17 cows in comparison to the 11.7 1940 average for the State, and where the owners had 85 acres out of their 115 acres that are cropped, while the State showed an average of 122 acres per farm in 1940 with only 53 acres cropped.

Now I wish to call your attention to the table supplied by Mr. Wells, referred to in his letter which is as follows:

Wisconsin: Comparison of typical commercial family operated dairy farms with 1940 census data

Item	Typical dairy farms	Average for 18 dairy counties		Average for State	
		All farms	Farms reporting item	All farms	Farms reporting item
Land in farms, 1939.....acres	114	112	112	122.5	122.5
Corn, 1939.....do	20	11.7	16.9	11.4	20.3
Oats, 1939.....do	20	12.5	14.8	11.0	15.4
Barley, 1939.....do	7.4	7.5	10.8	3.7	11.0
Hay, 1939.....do	24.3	20.9	22.1	21.1	22.7
Milk cows, 1940 ¹number	17.4	13.8	15.0	11.7	13.1
Milk production per cow, 1939.....pounds	4,170	6,158		5,680	
Hours of work per year, 1939:					
Operator and family.....number	4,356				
Hired.....do	1,721				
Total (2-man farm).....do	6,077				

DAIRY FARMS

	1939		1942
	Typical	Census ²	Census ²
Gross income.....	\$2,115	\$1,603	\$1,387
Sales of dairy products.....	\$1,225	\$1,041	\$907
Percent dairy sales are of gross income.....	58	65	65

¹ Typical farm—number of cows milked Jan. 1, 1940. Census farms—number of cows milked Jan. 1, and still on farms Apr. 1, 1940.

² Farms having 40 percent or more of their income from dairy products.

By telephone and personal conference I found that the 1939 farm net cash income for the selected dairy farms in 18 counties was only \$1,019. Also that the hours of work per year for 1942 was 6,438 hours in comparison to the 6,077 hours in 1939.

You will note that on these typical dairy farms that they required 6,077 hours of work in 1939. Mr. Wells advises me that these operations required 6,438 hours in 1942. You will also note that table 1 shows a net profit to these Wisconsin dairy farms of \$2,190 in 1942, and Mr. Wells advises me that this comparable net income in 1939 was \$1,019.

From the above, then, it would appear that in 1939 on these typical dairy farms selected farms, it showed 6,438 man counties, with 85 acres out of 115 in crops, gave return to the farm labor of 16 cents per hour for man labor—\$1,019 divided by 6,077. In 1942 on these same selected farms, it showed 6,438 man hours with \$2,190 net cash income, or 34 cents per hour—\$2,190 divided by 6,438. In fact, Mr. Wylie Goodsell, of the B. A. E. gives this as 33.9 cents per hour, and figures the 1939 income on the basis of 13-plus cents per hour when interests is deducted.

At this point there are a few facts which I wish to call to the attention of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCANLON] who, according to the press, is head of the committee to protect the consumer. My personal opinion is that 395 other Members of this House are just as much interested in the consumers of the Nation as are the fighting forty. First, I would like to call attention to the fact that in 1939 the labor on selected dairy farms in Wisconsin brought only 16 cents an hour, and in 1942 only 34 cents an hour. You will also note in Mr. Wells' letter and in the table which he submitted that he

says that these farms "are considered to be about two-man farms in size, including an operator, family help, and some hired labor at harvest time." In other words, this is a family income, or at least a two-man operation, and even using the selected dairymen in the 18 southern Wisconsin counties, it would not be more than \$1,095 per person, or \$2.71 per day. How many people in the group which Mr. SCANLON represents do you suppose have an hourly wage of 34 cents, or receive but \$1,095 annually? \$1,095 for 365 days is \$2.71 a day only. I trust that the roll-backers will note that the farm women of America are actually working together with their children as never before in their lives to provide this needed food. I also hope that they realize that these farm people are carrying on this great work with only 40 percent of them having electric lights in their homes, and with only 1 out of 10 of them with modern conveniences in their homes. I wish that my colleague from Pennsylvania would ask his audiences how many of them in each audience have electric lights and bath tubs in their homes and what their daily income is at this time, and find out how far it is from \$2.71 per day.

My good friend and colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] often asks for a better plan than the roll-back subsidies, but I have never noted that he yielded long enough to have the question answered. It is surely difficult to unscramble a scrambled egg when so many insist on further scrambling. However, at this time I wish to make a few suggestions to the professional roll-back subsidy advocates. If this group is really interested in providing food at a reasonable price to the low-income groups, why do they not support legislation like the Herter-Aiken bill, which re-

vives the stamp plan to provide this food? If this group wants to do something really constructive, why do they not bring their pressure to bear on the O. P. A. and ask this agency how much longer they are going to let the man with the price obtain cream without points and make the average citizen pay 5 points for cottage cheese made from the skim milk. They could find out how much longer the O. P. A. is going to allow cream to go point-free, so that the man with the price can secure all he pleases, from which to make butter; and yet compel the average citizen to pay 16 points for butter made from the same cream. Third, how much longer is this group going to allow the O. P. A. to knowingly or unknowingly protect the oleo interests by not putting a ceiling on oleo?

The roll-back subsidy group are making a big hue and cry about rolling back the price of butter 5 cents a pound, or with, at the most, forty to fifty million dollars a year subsidy. Yet they see the O. P. A. without protest allow the oleo interests to sell this product for from 17 to 29 cents a pound. If the price of oleo were rolled back to what some of it is being sold for and squeeze out some of this 12 cents a pound, it would represent a saving of part of this \$72,000,000 annually on the 600,000,000 pounds plus of oleo that are being manufactured this year. The roll-back subsidy group could easily show the O. P. A. that they already have a ceiling of 11 cents plus on soybean oil, 13 cents plus on cottonseed oil, 13 cents plus on peanut oil, 12½ to 14½ cents per pound on powdered skim, or 1½ cents per pound on skim milk in fluid form and since the Oleo Institute shows that these products make up a large percentage of the ingredients of oleo, there should not be much difficulty in arriving at a ceiling price for this product. In other words, although some oleo is being sold at 17 cents a pound, other oleo is being sold for 29 cents a pound, and the subsidy group up to this time has made no effort to protect the consumers of America so far as this product is concerned.

However, they do insist in all their righteousness that it is imperative to roll back the dairy farmer's prices, where in 1942 the laborer has been receiving 34 cents or less per hour for labor that goes into his product. And why?

I note in the 1942 production of oleo-margarine that they used 74,000,000 pounds of skim milk, although they call it milk. At the O. P. A. ceiling price, this would be not over 1½ cents a pound. As long as this is being sold as an ingredient of oleo at 17-29 cents a pound, it would seem on the face of it that this was a rather large margin that might need attention before the roll-backers start on people who are receiving 34 cents an hour for their labor in 1942.

Why do not the protectors of the consumer question the advisability of asking the O. P. A. to check up a little on the filled milk that is being manufactured at this time, if they are really interested in the welfare of the consumer of this country.

Why do not they find out why filled milk is being sold without a ceiling price and without any points, and being sold also at a price equal to the regular evaporated milk that is made from normal milk. Of course, when they find this out from the O. P. A., they can also find out why the War Production Board allocated 7,600 tons of tin plate in the last 2 years to this filled milk industry, when it has been very difficult even to get enough tin to repair a vat in a corner cheese factory in Wisconsin.

It is surprising to read in the Milwaukee Journal recently an article with a headline, "Milk picture turning sour?" Is it so surprising when you see an organized group trying to roll back the dairy group where the selected individuals of the dairy industry are on a 34-cent-per-hour basis?

There is one more situation that I would like to call to the attention of the roll-backers at this time. At Wisconsin's largest livestock market, day after day, 100-pound pigs are selling for 8 cents a pound. I receive the market prices as issued. Of course, you all know that the parity price of hogs is 12 cents per pound at this time, and that the parity does not apply to just the 200- to 270-pound hogs which have support prices. When the support price was announced, too much emphasis was not put on the weights for which the support price was made. Now, if this group is interested in providing food for all, why do they not ask the O. P. A. to remove ration points on pork for 60 days so that the average citizen can secure and process these hogs that are selling for so much less than even the support price. It has been demonstrated that the man with the price will get his product regardless, but here is an opportunity to provide cheaper meat to the great majority of our people.

Now let us get a few things here straight from the shoulder. I was home the same as most of you this summer. I spent every possible minute with the groups of my district. I tried to obtain the facts and I tried to give the facts. These groups included the A. A. A., service clubs, county agents, F. S. A., auto dealers, P. C. A. labor delegations, cheese makers, bankers, the Farm Bureau, feed dealers, newspaper editors, granges, and groups interested in social service. What were the outstanding impressions I obtained?

One was that this war is a serious business to these people, with practically everyone having a blood relative in the armed service.

Second, was the fact that at no meeting was there any mention made about prices and ways of getting rich out of this war. The whole approach was on the basis of how best they could increase the food production in 1944 and how best these other groups could carry their part of the load in furnishing the services incident to the food-production program. They realized that they had a duty to perform and that in addition to the normal desire to produce, it was now the patriotic desire to produce in order to furnish the food for their sons and daughters in

the armed forces of our country. When you realize that the rural people of our country, although only about 25 percent of the population, raise toward half the children of the country, you can appreciate how these producers of food have a very personal interest in producing it. These people know that they are receiving from .6 to 2 cents less per pound for cheese than the producers in other States. They know of other injustices that have been accorded them, but the over-all objective of furnishing food to win the war overshadows any of their personal grievances. These rural people show the strain of these 2 years of increased food production and it irks me to hear people who have never done a real day's work in their lives complaining about the 34 cents per hour this group receives at this time.

When I returned to Washington, what did I hear? The same old story: Price! Price! Price! For 9 months, we have been hearing about the wonders of the roll-back subsidies. Two food czars have passed out of the picture. No doubt because they did not see that the vote crop should have preference over the food crop. We now have Marvin Jones trying to bring these forces together. He is pleading with Congress today to come to some decision on this subsidy program so that he can set up a food program for 1944. It would not embarrass me to support a roll-back subsidy program if they could be used to increase food production, but they have not and if anyone thinks they have, I shall be glad to yield for him to so state at this time and show where they have.

We rolled back the price of butter last June, and the production each month has gone down below the year previous, and in October, the production of creamery butter was the lowest of any month since the records were kept by the United States Department of Agriculture.

In fact, I really have a sympathetic feeling for the professional subsidy roll-backers. In the large, they represent the New Deal part of the administration. It must be humiliating to them to make the two public confessions to the people of America that this roll-back subsidy issue presents:

First, these roll-backers are telling the Nation that after 11 years of complete control of Congress, after seeing the people with the highest individual as well as the highest national income as a result of the war that the country has ever had—that the people cannot pay for the food they eat, although this food represents only 20 percent of the cost of living. It is surely a humiliating admission for this group to make.

Second, these roll-back advocates are publicly announcing to the farm people of America and in no unspeakable terms, that although parity is a splendid word to talk about and when the individuals and the Nation have the greatest income in the history of the country, the palace guard that is directing the Agricultural Department cannot even provide the parity for the farmers of the country. In fact, it has not been provided even when

the law said it should, nor, of course, has the cost of farm labor been included in arriving at the parities that have been allowed to prevail.

I well realize the cheap politics involved in this issue. The anti-roll-backers must face this situation. If food goes up, the anti-roll-backers will receive the criticism and the blame. Right here and now I want the subsidy roll-backers to understand also the other situation. That is when the people go to the market place and cannot find the food for their families, they will also know who to blame and can put it on the doorstep of the cheap politics involved in the roll-back subsidies where producers receiving 34 cents an hour for their labor are the victims of the roll-back.

A further situation which I wish to call to the attention of the roll-backers is that by following their leadership, a 30-percent pay-roll tax can result and a sales tax can be imposed on the people of this country in addition to the present taxes. So I say, let us unite to roll up production of food and give little heed to the professional roll-backers who are trying to roll back a group of our society which is making a contribution that the rural people of America have made, are making, and will continue to make regardless of all the fake, false, and unfair propaganda that emanates from Washington.

Marvin Jones is right in asking that this question be settled once and for all. We should give him this support. We owe this to the armed forces of our country, we owe this to the people of our country, who hope and pray that no one of us will do anything that will retard the day when this war can be brought to a successful conclusion.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to my good friend and colleague of the committee.

Mr. GILLIE. The gentleman from Wisconsin spoke a few moments ago about the points on butter. What are the points on oleo?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The points on oleo have been half or less than what they were on butter.

Mr. GILLIE. Are they 16 points on butter?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes, 16. They were 6 points, I think, the last time I saw, on oleo. One question I would like to see answered is, if oleo is equal to butter why does it not have the same points?

Mr. GILLIE. What is there to prevent a man going to a creamery and getting a gallon of sour cream and churning his own butter? What would he have to do then, pay points?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. He does not have to pay points. If you read the Washington Star last Sunday there are five groups who want to be sure they keep all the bureaucrats well greased up with cream and who are not satisfied with 75 percent of the cream they get now. They want more. Then they do

not want the average person, even, to have a chance to eat cottage cheese they get out of skimmed milk. So if anyone is interested in the food program he will find the man with the price is getting pretty good care all the way along. He can get his own cream and go home and make his own butter without paying any points. But if the housewife goes to the store she has to give up 16 points. I would not say so much about that if it was not, in my opinion, part of a scheme with more or less administration backing to tell the people what they are going to eat. They have been telling them what to think and now they want to tell them what to eat.

Mr. GILLIE. Would you suggest, then, that people do that very thing, that people go to a dairyman or creamery man and get a gallon or half a gallon or quart of cream and take it home and churn it to make butter so they do not have to give up any points?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No; I do not suggest that. I do not believe in letting the man with the price have the cream and let the children in the schools drink the skimmed milk. So far as I personally am concerned, I do not ask for any more than any citizen of the United States is entitled to have. So far I have done it that way and I expect to continue. I just make this point: If this great group of consumer protectors who are going around and being called the Fighting Forty—just as if they were the only ones interested in the consumers of this country—if they were really interested in the consumers of this country, they would do something about this thing instead of trying to make a cheap, political issue out of it. That is just exactly what is trying to be done at this time in my humble opinion.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I say I am a member of the organization known as the Congressmen's Committee for the Protection of the Consumer. First of all, there are no partisan politics involved in that organization. We have repeatedly invited all the Members of the House on both sides. We have some Republicans in the organization, and hence, there is no attempt to make cheap partisan politics out of this fight for the consumer, as the gentleman has just stated. We stand on the record in this fight. We maintain that time and events will demonstrate we were right, those of us who voted for subsidies, and that those who opposed them were wrong.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is what you may think. I do not yield to the gentleman to make a speech. I do not care whether they are Republicans or new dealers. They are on the wrong track, and cannot justify their position with facts. You can make a speech on your own time. I will tell the gentleman from New York right now, if he thinks his people up in New York City, who, one of his colleagues on this floor said recently, were getting at least

\$1 an hour, should not find it necessary to have the Congressmen figure out a scheme of rolling back a class of people getting 34 cents an hour. He can follow that course. I cannot tell him what is going to happen in the future. But I will tell the gentleman from New York right now that the people of this country have already gotten tired of having people tell them how they are going to think and it appears they are good and tired of having people tell them what they are going to eat.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. You say people are getting tired. Does not the gentleman believe that the people are getting mighty tired of prices soaring sky high and taking money from their pocket-books?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would not admit that it necessarily has to be sky high unless we let it be run by those that are trying to run it now. But, if you will follow the leadership of Mr. Claude Wickard, who tried to give us a program of production of abundance of food, I do not think the gentleman from New York or any one else will have to worry about the food being produced and at a fair price to the consumer. But, if we follow the leadership of the people who think with your group, I am afraid that when the housewife goes to the store the cupboard will be bare, because there are no calories in these roll-backs. The sooner your group finds it out the better it will be.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I suggest to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] that if a lot of people are not willing to pay to the farmer a fair price for his milk, you will find icicles on your step some morning instead of a bottle of milk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

ELECTRIC REFRIGERATORS FOR HOSPITALS

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for a great many years the Good Samaritan Hospital in my district has served the public health by caring for the sick, lame, and infirm. During the past 2 years its facilities as well as the other hospitals in my district, have been taxed to the utmost in caring for the additional population of thousands of men and women who came into the area to work in the ordnance and war plants of the Nation. During this time the equipment has been strained to the breaking point, and like the deacon's one-horse shay, the electric refrigerator has worn out.

In its effort to preserve and safeguard the foods for the sick, the hospital attempted to purchase a new refrigerator to replace the worn-out one and found out like all the citizens of the land that it must ask some agency. It followed

the usual procedure of securing an application, then filled it out, and sent it to Washington.

The application stated its need for a new refrigerator was to care for and preserve food for the sick and infirm in the hospital. As usual, no satisfactory acknowledgment was received and I was requested to check on the matter. I talked with the agency here in Washington and finally found that such an application had been received. I then asked for the allowance of a privilege to purchase. However, the agency said, "Why, Mr. Congressman, don't you know that electric refrigerators are not being allotted to hospitals?" I said, "Why not, it is to be used to preserve food for the sick and infirm, and I see no reason for denying refrigerators to hospitals."

Further, the agency then said it was sorry. I then asked, "What can be done?" The agency said, "Secure an old-fashioned ice box and get an ice delivery." I agree it is cold on Lake Erie and the hospital along with all its additional burdens, is patriotic and would be willing to have someone go out on the Lake and chop out a cake of ice each day. However, there is a shortage of manpower and the hospital is unable to find a person who is willing to chop out a piece of ice as suggested by the agency here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, with this denial fresh in mind, I remember reading in a Washington newspaper and seeing a picture in Life magazine where one Harry Hopkins received "a brand new electric refrigerator" for his new home in Georgetown. My constituents ask me how it is that, "brand new" electric refrigerators are delivered here in Washington, but are denied to preserve and safeguard the food for those who are sick in the hospitals.

I am glad that Mr. Hopkins received his electric refrigerator so that he is not obliged to chop his ice each day from the waters of the Potomac, but nevertheless people back in my district feel that the sick and infirm in hospitals should be given an electric refrigerator for the preservation and safeguarding of food.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia for 2 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. HARRIS of Virginia (at the request of Mr. BURCH), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

To Mr. GAMELE (at the request of Mr. HANCOCK), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. WALTER (at the request of Mr. HOCH) on account of illness.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1544. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

LXXXIX—677

S. 1576. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day deliver to the White House for forwarding to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 255. An act for the relief of Col. E. H. Tarbutton;

H. R. 302. An act for the relief of Robert Griffin;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Clare A. Miller;

H. R. 1379. An act for the relief of Gerald Estell Proctor;

H. R. 1640. An act for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Price;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Ronald A. Cox;

H. R. 2080. An act to provide temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service;

H. R. 2545. An act for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall;

H. R. 2641. An act to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain lands for addition to the Sequoia National Park;

H. R. 3039. An act for the relief of Mrs. C. W. Selby;

H. R. 3299. An act for the relief of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico; and

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights.

COMMITTEE FOR FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES AND SOLDIERS' VOTE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, despite the lateness of the hour and the sparseness of attendance this afternoon, I am compelled to take the floor to make certain that the RECORD will not be in a state whereby the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will remain unchallenged.

In a speech on what purports to be a speech on the Bill of Rights, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] saw fit to make an attack on the President's Committee for Fair Employment Practices, and also to state his viewpoint with regard to the soldiers' vote bill. Throughout the gentleman's speech, the gentleman rested his attack on the Committee for Fair Employment Practices, as well as his attack on the attempt to enfranchise men in American uniform, on what he deemed to be the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson.

I think it is only fair—

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that those words be taken down, because I made no such intimation that I was for disfranchising soldiers in uniform and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I will stand by those words.

Mr. RANKIN. It is false and I am going to demand that those words be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi will indicate the words objected to.

Mr. RANKIN. Where the gentleman from New York said that I favored disfranchising the men in uniform he not only made a false statement but he made a slanderous statement. I made no such intimation. I am doing everything I can to make it possible for them to vote.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The gentleman's request was that my words be taken down. He should indicate the words he wants taken down. The statement I made is in writing and I will stand by it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Mississippi insist on his point of order?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the words objected to. (The SPEAKER resumed the chair.)

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the language objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The gentleman from Mississippi saw fit to make an attack on the President's Committee for Fair Employment Practices and also to state his viewpoint with regard to the soldiers' vote bill. Throughout the gentleman's speech the gentleman rests his attack on the Committee for Fair Employment Practices as well as his attack on the attempt to enfranchise the men in American uniform on what he deemed to be the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, those are the words I object to. He falsely accused me there of attempting to disfranchise the men in uniform. That is a violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The words speak for themselves as to whether or not they are unparliamentary.

The SPEAKER. The Chair read the statement and then listened to its reading and the Chair can hardly think that the language of the gentleman from New York was more than expressing his opinion of the attitude of the gentleman from Mississippi. The Chair very seriously doubts that it is a violation of the rules of the House or a direct charge impugning the gentleman's motives or impugning his character.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to discuss this proposition, but there are very few Members here and I do not propose for that language to stand unchallenged. I therefore make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his point of order for me to pay a tribute?

The SPEAKER. No; the Chair cannot recognize the gentleman when a point of no quorum is made. The Chair has counted. No quorum is present. There is nothing to do except to call the House or adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m. the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 16, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Thursday, December 16, 1943, at 10 a. m., to consider H. R. 1238. Hon. Myers Cooper, former Governor of Ohio and president of the National Council of Real Estate Taxpayers, will be a witness.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Friday, December 17, 1943, at 10 a. m., to consider H. R. 2241, a bill to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument, Wyo.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 38. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2801, a bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 955). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 376. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2350, a bill to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents; without amendment (Rept. No. 956). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 957. Report on the disposition of certain papers from several agencies of the Federal Government. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SOMERS of New York: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. S. 184. An act to provide for the presentation of silver medals to certain members of the Peary Polar Expedition of 1908-9; with amendment (Rept. No. 958). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 3846. A bill to provide for the education and training of members of the armed forces and the merchant marine after their separation from service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 3847. A bill to exempt certain officers and employees of the Office of Price Admin-

istration from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3848. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 3849. A bill to provide mustering-out pay or credit for the purpose of reestablishment in civilian employment those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 3850. A bill to provide for the education and training of members of the armed forces and the merchant marine after their discharge or conclusion of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 3851. A bill ceding and reserving to the State of Oklahoma jurisdiction to serve civil or criminal process, and to tax railroad companies and other corporations, and their franchises and property on military and naval reservations and other Federal areas within the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution to grant furloughs under certain conditions to men in the armed services; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. Res. 382. Resolution to investigate the fire insurance and allied lines of business; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 3852. A bill for the relief of the O. S. Stapley Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana:

H. R. 3853. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leroy A. Robbins; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4076. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Paul F. Regnier and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4077. Also, petition of Paul F. Regnier and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4078. Also, petition of Robert Doerste and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4079. Also, petition of the Mayfair Hotel and signed by 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4080. Also, petition of the Barry-Wehmiller Machinery Co., and signed by 30 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibi-

tion for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4081. By Mr. ELLIS: Petition of Mrs. E. F. Kincaid and about 30 other Huntington, W. Va., citizens, endorsing the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4082. Also, petition of Mrs. R. L. Hutchison and about 40 other citizens of Huntington, W. Va., urging support of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition within the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4083. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of 80 members and friends of the Calvary Baptist Church of Stafford, Kans., endorsing Senate bill 860 and House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4084. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of sundry citizens of Burlington, Iowa, urging support of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition within the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4085. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolutions of the California Wool Growers Association, adopted at San Francisco November 18 and 19, 1943, relating to predatory animal control; and recommending that adequate ammunition be released for the use of hunters in harvesting game crops which will supply large amounts of meats and hides, which will be lost to predators if not properly harvested; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4086. Also, resolution of the County Supervisors Association of California, Sacramento, Calif., opposing passage of Senate bill 1089; to the Committee on Elections No. 3.

4087. Also, resolutions of the California Wool Growers Association, adopted at San Francisco November 18-19, 1943, relating to the purchase of domestic wool by the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Emmanuel, God with us, again by Thy grace the journeying months have brought us to the shining glory of the Holy Night—the light that shone when hope was born. In our grateful hearts we know that that heavenly beacon can never fail, because it reveals to all men the heart of God and the meaning of life, making mother and child forever sacred and softening the hurt of the world.

Amid the tumult and terror of global strife may we hear anew the tidings of the angels' song and the music that is not of earth. As gentle good will lights our eyes, we know that we are beckoned not to follow far by starlight to some distant shrine, for the Babe whose coming broke the ages in two is no longer Bethlehem's pride and Mary's joy but the whole wide world's; and the blessed gift is given to every heart that makes Him room. May an understanding sympathy that knows no boundaries of bor-